The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXII, No. 1 January, 1945

CONTENTS

Dishonesty and Graft . . *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 1

Salting the Wells . . . *Francis J. McGarrigle, S.J.* 12

Some Recent Novels in Catholic Perspective *Eugene M. Burke, C.S.P.* 23

Veni de Libano . . . . . *James A. Kleist, S.J.* 31

Catholic Population Again . . . *George A. Gallik* 39

Why a Catholic Forum? . . . *James A. Magner* 43

The Church and the State of Siege . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 54

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

School-Children and Confession 64

Condition for Absolution 65

Public Discussions of Objectionable Books 66

Confessions of Children 66

The Morality of Robot Bombing 67

Contents Continued on Next Page

Published monthly by The Board of Trustees of The American Ecclesiastical Review, from The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, U. S. currency or equivalent: United States and Canada, $4.00—Foreign Postage, $1.00 additional. 40 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, Box 20A, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1945, by The American Ecclesiastical Review

Contents Continued from Previous Page

A Confessor's Problem 67
Sum for Grave Theft 68
The Lighted Candle at Baptism 69

ANALECTA 71

BOOK REVIEWS

Molders of the Medieval Mind, *by Frank P. Cassidy* . . 75
With the Help of Thy Grace, *by John V. Matthews, S.J.* . 76
The General Who Rebuilt the Jesuits
by Robert G. North, S.J. 77
Saving Angel, *by T. Lawrason Riggs* 78

BOOK NOTES 80

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

We Solicit Your Co-operation

Notice of change of address should be sent to us promptly, and at the same time the old address should be given.

Sometimes a subscriber overlooks reporting change of address; and now and then a subscriber dies, and in either case his copy continues to be sent to his former address. In such cases notification from Successor or Pastor would be appreciated.

You May Use the Blank Below:

NAME ....
OLD ADDRESS: ....
NEW ADDRESS: ....
OTHER INFORMATION: ....

DISHONESTY AND GRAFT

It is not easy for a public official to be perfectly honest in the performance of his civic duties. He encounters numerous opportunities of benefitting himself and his friends at the expense of the community. The temptation is augmented by the realization that if he is shrewd and circumspect, there is little danger that he will be caught. It is very difficult to convict a clever politician, even when it is an undeniable fact that he is enriching himself by means that are essentially no different from those employed by the highway robber. By a strange inconsistency, a man may be perfectly honest in his private life, while stooping to every form of venality and corruption in his public capacity. In this connection Lecky made the astute remark: "It is probable that the moral standard of most men is much lower in political judgments than in private matters in which their own interests are concerned."[1]

It would seem, too, that democracy offers more opportunities and greater incentive to dishonest practices on the part of officeholders than any other form of government. At any rate, in the United States, during the century and a half of its existence as an organized democracy, there has been an appalling amount of political corruption. Peter H. Odegard does not hesitate to say: "Among the great modern nations the United States has perhaps the least enviable reputation as regards the probity of its political life . . . For this the American form of government is partially accountable."[2]

This deplorable feature of American public life is not confined to the lower grades of officialdom. "There have been in the United States governors who traffiicked in pardons, who employed the state military forces to break strikes for friendly employers and who used their veto power to defeat legislation unfavorable to their friends."[3] Many a dishonest scheme has been concocted in the halls of Congress, and at times in our history the White House itself has not been free from well-founded suspicion of an unethical use of the supreme executive power.

---

[1] *History of European Morals* (London, 1877), I, 151.

[2] *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* (New York, 1937), art. "Corruption," II, 452.

[3] *Ibid.*

Crooked political activities are sometimes directed to the winning of prestige or office; but the usual objective is money—significantly designated "graft" in common American speech. Beyond doubt, only a small proportion of the facts concerning the thievery perpetrated by public officials in our country will ever be revealed; but what has been made public constitutes a story that is quite as fantastic as the best efforts of a top-notch fiction writer. Thus, in one of the historical works of Charles and Mary Beard we read this account of an incident that occurred in New York around 1870 under the auspices of the infamous Tweed Ring: "The construction of a county court house, which was supposed to cost a quarter of a million dollars, in fact involved an outlay of eight millions, in which the city was charged $470 apiece for chairs, and $400,000 apiece for safes in which to store valuable papers."[4] Speaking of this era of New York history, Harper's *Encyclopaedia of United States History* says: "The operations of Tweed and his associates—known as the Tweed Ring—during their five years' domination in New York added over $100,000,000 to the bonded debt of the city, doubled its annual expenditures, and cost tax-payers the enormous sum of $160,000,000."[5]

The prevalence of political dishonesty in our country is particularly obnoxious to upright Catholics because there is indubitable evidence that members of the Catholic Church in public life have employed their official positions in a sordid and sinful fashion for their own benefit. And the clergy of our Church, if they view the matter honestly, must admit that as a group they are not taking a sufficiently definite and outspoken stand on dishonesty in civil office. Those who have been deputed by the Church of Christ to expound the law of God and to labor for the salvation of mankind cannot in conscience be silent when the law of God is being so flagrantly violated and the souls of many committed to their pastoral care are in jeopardy. It is becoming increasingly evident that logical and unchangeable norms of right and wrong are found only in the Catholic Church. Outside the Church it is becoming more and more customary to formulate moral laws according to personal inclinations and the demands of expediency. Accordingly, it is only from the bishops and priests of the Catholic Church that our public servants can expect clear and consistent guidance and admonition regarding their official duties. If the Catholic clergy fail in their duty in this respect, those who hold office throughout our land will have no one to teach them what they must do in order to fulfil properly the seventh commandment of God and to urge them to be faithful to the obligations incumbent on them by the virtue of justice.

---

[4] *The Rise of American Civilization* (New York, 1931), II, 310.

[5] *Encyclopaedia of United States History* (New York, 1905), art. "Tweed," IX, 135.

The three types of justice commonly differentiated by Catholic theologians—legal, distributive and commutative—impose their respective obligations on those in public office. It is not within the scope of this article to discuss the various theological views concerning the precise nature of these three species of justice, particularly the essence of legal justice and its relation to the other two species.[6] It suffices for our purpose to accept the general concepts of these three categories commonly agreed upon by theologians and to apply them to the question we are treating. The present article will be concerned with the duties of civil office-holders stemming from legal and distributive justice, a subsequent article will examine the problem from the standpoint of commutative justice.

Legal justice imposes on individuals the obligation of rendering to the community that which is its due. The purpose of legal justice is to safeguard the rights of society; and every society, from the primary social body, the family, up to the society of the entire human race, has claims on its individual members. Sometimes the function of legal justice is expressed by the statement that it is the justice to be exercised by the parts of a social body toward the whole body. It must not be concluded from this that legal justice is primarly required of those subject to authority, binding them to obey the rulers of society. On the contrary, according to St. Thomas, legal justice belongs in the first place to the ruler.[7] This is another way of saying that there is a graver obligation on the part of those who govern than on the part of those who are governed to labor for the welfare of the community. Furthermore, it implies that those in public office are bound to employ their authority, not for their own benefit, but for the advantage of the society. This is a grave obligation resting on the shoulders of civil officials, and to reverse the order in a matter of importance would be a mortal sin against the law of God.

---

[6] Cf. Merkelbach, *Summa Theolgiae Moralis* (Paris, 1938), Vol. II, n. 252 ff.

[7] Cf. *Sum. Theol.*, II-II, q. 58, a. 6.

Pope Leo XIII, in his Encyclical *Rerum novarum*, proclaims this fundamental truth in these words: "Rulers should anxiously safeguard the community and all its parts; the community, because the conservation of the community is so emphatically the business of the supreme power, that the safety of the commonwealth is not only the first law, but is a government's whole reason of existence; and the parts, because both philosophy and the Gospel agree in laying down that the object of the administration of the state should be, not the advantage of the ruler, but the benefit of those over whom he rules."[8]

Catholic officials, taught by their Church that all civil authority comes from God, should be especially impressed with the grave responsibilities incumbent on them in their public capacity. This thought was in the mind of Pope Leo XIII when he declared: "The gift of authority is from God, and is as it were, a participation of the highest of all sovereignties; and it should be exercised as the power of God is exercised—with a fatherly solicitude which not only guides the whole but reaches to details as well."[9] St. Thomas does not hesitate to declare that the ruler of a civil society is in the society "as the soul is in the body and as God is in the world."[10] Those public officials who have been inaugurated into office by an oath have an extra obligation to perform their duties faithfully, arising from the virtue of religion, besides the obligation of legal justice, and if they deliberately fail to perform their tasks in the manner expected of them, the violation of their oath adds a new species to their sin.

Those who hold office in a democracy must remember that they are subject to the laws, even though they themselves participated in passing them, or are the authoritative judges or executives for the observance of these laws by the citizens. Indeed, the days of absolute monarchs who were above the civil law seem to have passed away entirely.[11] In our country any civil official, however high his position, who exempts himself from a law by which the common citizen is bound, fails against legal justice. Moreover, abuses of this nature are destructive of the spirit of democcracy. In the Prohibition era there were numerous examples of public officials who had voted for this amendment and were outwardly zealous for its observance, yet at the same time were using their influence to procure an abundance of liquor for themselves and for their friends. Such hypocrisy reminds one of the pharisees whom Christ so vigorously denounced.

---

[8] *Five Great Encyclicals* (New York: Paulist Press, 1939), p. 17.

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] *De Regimine Principum*, Lib. I, cap. 12 (Parma ed., XVI, 235).

At times it is comparatively easy for one in public office to evade the payment of just taxes, even to the extent of a considerable sum of money. Now, while some theologians have upheld the view that tax laws are purely penal, not obliging under pain of sin to their observance but only obliging to the acceptance of the penalty in the event of conviction,[12] the far more probable opinion holds that they bind in legal justice, so that it would be a grave sin to refuse to pay a just tax bill for a sizable amount, as would be a sum in three figures.[13]

By virtue of legal justice public officials must devote to their tasks the attention and the time required for their proper fulfilment. If an office-holder neglects the work assigned to him—for example, by taking extended vacations—he is guilty of a serious offence against the law of God. As a public servant, he must make himself available to the reasonable demands of his fellow-citizens who wish to discuss with him some matter of official business. It is ridiculous, as well as wrong, when a minor official, such as an alderman or a member of the state legislature, stands on his dignity to such an extent that it is more difficult to see him than it is to get an interview with the President.

Sometimes a person is given a "soft" job, a sinecure, instituted simply to reward him for his party loyalty, and not because of any public necessity or utility. As must be evident to any intelligent person, to take a salary for a position of this kind is downright theft. No Catholic in such a situation can worthily approach the sacraments unless he is resolved to resign his sinecure as soon as possible.

---

[11] Cf. Merkelbach, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, n. 292.

[12] Cf. Davis, *Moral and Pastoral Theology*, 3rd ed. (New York, 1938), II, 338 ff.

[13] Cf. Crowe, *The Moral Obligation of Paying Just Taxes* (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University Press, 1944).

Distributive justice, also, has important bearings on the official activities of civil authorities. This type of justice is concerned with the equitable distribution of benefits and obligations among the members of a community. It is the one type of justice that is proper to those who govern, since legal and commutative justice must be practised both by rulers and by ruled. Pope Leo XIII, in the Encyclical *Rerum novarum*, pointed out the importance of this virtue when he wrote: "Among the many and grave duties of rulers who would do their best for their people, the first and chief is to act with strict justice—with that justice which is called in the schools *distributive*—towards each and every class."[14]

Distributive justice has its source in the principle that the goods and the burdens of a community should be apportioned to the members according to their merits, capacities, and needs. Its criterion is not mathematic equality, as is that of commutative justice, but the equity of due proportion. Strangely enough, it frequently happens that one in authority conceives the idea that his position entitles him to distribute funds, offices, and other goods of common possession according to his individual tastes. Thus, his personal whims and inclinations become the sole norm of distribution. Such a superior is guilty of violating distributive justice.

The duty of practicing distributive justice incumbent on the civil office-holder is analogous to that which binds the heads of other forms of society. Thus, in the domestic circle parents are obliged to be fair toward their children. If they are partial toward one or several, to the exclusion of the others, they are failing egregiously in their parental duty. The religious superior who shows favoritism toward certain members of his community commits sin. Ecclesiastical rulers are bound to confer offices according to the merits and capabilities of the candidates, without regard for personal preferences. The Church law explicitly asserts that a bishop has a grave obligation in conscience to bestow a vacant parish on that priest whom he regards as more worthy to rule it, without any acceptance of persons.[15]

Similarly, a civil official authorized to fill a subordinate post is bound in conscience to choose the candidate whom he considers most deserving and most capable of performing the required tasks so as to promote the common welfare. It would be interesting to know how many of those who hold positions of authority in our country are conscious of this obligation of distributive justice. Certainly, as anyone acquainted with actual conditions is well aware, the factor of personal preference without any regard for the common good frequently dominates exclusively the apportioning of jobs and favors.

---

[14] *Five Great Encyclicals* (New York: Paulist Press, 1939), p. 16.

[15] Cf. Canon 459, §1.

The so-called "spoils system," usually dated from the administration of Andrew Jackson, is still in vogue, to some extent, in our country. This expression is sometimes extended to include all forms of political knavery, but in its primary significance it means the distribution of jobs in the public service to the supporters of the party in power, at the present time usually called patronage.[16] We should not condemn this form of the "spoils system" as a violation of distributive justice, without making certain qualifications. If it simply means that posts of authority and responsibility, which are to be conferred by executive appointment, are reserved exclusively for members of the dominant party, it would not seem to be forbidden. For, such a system makes for greater harmony among those in administrative positions, and consequently for greater unity and strength in governmental activities. Furthermore, a public executive who sincerely believes that the political tenets of his party are most beneficial for the welfare of the country is quite consistent in regarding adherence to those tenets as an important factor toward the common good, rendering the party members much more worthy of public office than the members of the opposition. Finally, since it is a recognized fact that those who win office by election will fill the vacant posts with applicants of their own political creed, we can regard the successful candidate as having a mandate from the majority of the people to make appointments in this fashion. From this standpoint, therefore, it would follow that distributive justice is not necessarily violated when state or federal officials, empowered to suggest or to select subordinate office-holders, make their choice exclusively from those affiliated with their own political party.

---

[16] Cf. Leonard D. White in *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* (New York, 1937), art. "Spoils System," VII, 301.

However, granted the lawfulness of the "spoils system" to this extent, many qualifications must be added in order that distributive justice may be protected. Even though the choice may be limited to the adherents of one party, it would be wrong to select among these an applicant less capable than other candidates. Above all, it would be a despicable and sinful thing to do this in consideration of a bribe. At present we are condemning this loathsome form of graft—all too common, alas, in our country—as a transgression of distributive justice, an act of dishonesty against the more worthy persons who are rejected because they cannot or will not pay the price that the official or the party demands. In a subsequent article the relation of this transaction to commutative justice will be considered.

The sin of selling a political appointment is greater when the one appointed is not only less worthy than other candidates but is positively unworthy, incapable of performing properly the duties connected with the office. On one occasion in one of our large cities the man appointed as keeper of the public records at a salary of $6500 a year could neither read nor write English.[17] Any official who would appoint an incompetent candidate to a civil post would not only fail by injustice against the worthy aspirants, but would also commit a sin of injustice against the community.

The civil service method, or merit system, which was established by our federal government in 1883, has done much toward securing for public offices better types of citizens than those selected by executive officials. Many offices are still filled by the latter method, though there is a tendency to embrace a wider range of positions under civil service appointments. For example, on June 25, 1938, the Ramspeck-O'Mahoney Postmaster Act was passed, according to which the postmaster positions of the first, second and third class throughout the country—almost 15,000 in number—are to be filled by the civil service system, and the incumbents are to hold office during good behavior. This is a vast improvement over the former method, which made these offices matter of presidential appointment for a period of four years, and afforded a means of rewarding the faithful henchmen of the successful party—a system which was hardly adapted to procure the most worthy and most capable postmasters.

---

[17] Cf. *The Business Value of the Merit System* (New York: National Civil Service Reform League, 1940), p. 3.

The usual procedure under civil service rules followed by the federal government when there is a position to be filled is for the civil service commission to submit to the appointing official the names of the three persons highest on the examination list.[18] One of these three must be chosen, but, for the second vacancy selection must be made from the group consisting of the remaining two and the next highest available eligible. The same procedure must be followed in filling additional vacancies until each eligible willing to accept has been considered in connection with three actual appointments. The selection must be made without regard to race or to political or religious considerations, except as authorized or required by law. An example of this exception is the law which forbids the appointment of any person who is a member of a political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of the constitutional form of government in the United States.[19]

The civil service method is certainly admirable, and in the course of years it has been accepted by a considerable number of the states and cities of our country. However, there are many desirable positions in federal, state, and local governments still subject to direct appointment. The obligations of those entrusted with these appointments are serious matters of conscience, the disregard of which would burden the soul of the appointing official with the guilt of grave sin.

The bishops and priests of the United States should make it matter of serious concern to induce Catholics in public office to ba scrupulously honest. The sound Catholic principles regarding the obligations in justice to which civil rulers are subject should be explained adequately in sermons and in catechetical instructions, particularly in parishes containing persons in governmental positions. It is to be noted that question 261 of the new Baltimore Catechism lists "the accepting of bribes by public officials" among the sins against the seventh commandment. The confessor of one who is vested with civil authority should deem it his duty to question this individual about his public conduct, if there is some reason to suspect that he is addicted to dishonest practices. This rule must be followed, even in the event that the penitent makes no reference to such misconduct. For, according to St. Alphonsus, the confessor of those in public stations must ordinarily admonish them about their duties even when they are invincibly ignorant of these obligations, because neglect of duty on the part of such persons is very harmful to the common good.[20] The application of this rule is certainly called for in the case of a Catholic official who receives the sacraments regularly and yet gives every indication of being involved in dishonest practices.

---

[18] Eligibility is not reckoned solely on the intellectual ability manifested by the examination. Veterans are given a preference on a five or ten point basis. No reasonable objection should be raised to this method of advancing those who have fought for our country.

[19] Cf. *Federal Employment under the Merit System* (Washington, 1940), pp. 58, 100.

The fact that an office-holder of this type is frequently very generous in his contributions to the Church and to pious causes must not deter a bishop or priest from admonishing or reproving him. Still less is a Catholic clergyman justified in omitting correction or reproof from fear that his personal friendship with an influential politician will thereby be jeopardized. And certainly, to invite a public official to address the Holy Name Society or to speak at a communion breakfast when everyone knows that he is engaged in numerous projects for obtaining graft is nothing less than a grave scandal.

Sometimes the excuse is given by public officials, or by their friends in an effort to defend them, that everyone in public life takes graft, and so, it can't be very wrong. This is an excuse which, even if it were based on a correct factual premise (which it is not), would not be valid. No matter how many persons commit a sin, it still remains a sin. And when those outside the pale of Catholic truth regard political dishonesty as something perfectly lawful, there is even greater reason for Catholics to uphold the principles of divine law both by word and by example. Today, the Catholic Church is the only institution in our land that is able to influence the lives of men toward virtue to any notable extent. Hence, all Catholics, both clergy and laity, should do their utmost toward giving the seventh commandment of God a practical significance in the public conduct of those who exercise civil authority in our country.

---

[20] Cf. *Theologia Moralis,* Lib. VI, n. 616.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

CARDINAL GIBBONS ON THE "INTOLERANCE" OF CATHOLICISM

The Church is, indeed, intolerant in this sense, that she can never confound truth with error; nor can she admit that any man is conscientiously free to reject the truth when its claims are convincingly brought home to the mind. Many Protestants seem to be very much disturbed by some such argument as this: Catholics are very ready now to proclaim freedom of conscience, because they are in the minority. When they once succeed in getting the upper hand in numbers and power they will destroy this freedom, because their faith teaches them to tolerate no doctrine other than the Catholic. It is, then, a matter of absolute necessity for us that they should never be allowed to get this advantage.

Now, in all this, there is a great mistake, which comes from not knowing the Catholic doctrine in its fullness. I shall not lay it down myself, lest it seem to have been gotten up for the occasion. I shall quote the great theologian Becanus, who taught the doctrine of the schools of Catholic Theology at the time when the struggle was hottest between Catholicity and Protestantism. He says that religious liberty may be tolerated by a ruler when it would do more harm to the state or to the community to repress it. The ruler may even enter into a compact in order to secure to his subjects this freedom in religious matters; and when once a compact is made it must be observed honestly in every point, just as every other lawful and honest contract. This is the true Catholic teaching on this point, according to Becanus and all Catholic theologians. So that if Catholics should gain the majority in a community where freedom of conscience is already secured to all by law, their very religion obliges them to respect the rights thus acquired by their fellow-citizens.

—*The Faith of Our Fathers* (New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1917), pp. 229 f.

SALTING THE WELLS

THE FACT OF ENVY

"Few," remarks Aeschylus in *Agamemnon*, "have the strength of character to rejoice in a friend's success without a touch of envy." The lad David whom Saul at first "loved exceedingly" (I Kings 16:21) saved the throne and crown for Saul by slaying the monster Goliath, and by his prowess otherwise in battle and leadership won the plaudits of Israel. "And Saul did not look on David with a good eye from that day and forward" (I Kings 18:19). The gratitude of Saul was a lance hurled by envy of the youth's popularity, which grazed his side and nearly pinned him to the wall (I Kings 19:10). Then followed continuous murderous machination against David who shared Saul's sun of public notice.

An instinctive feeling of loss in the perception of another's gain characterises most men; nor need we be initiated into the inaccessible mysteries of Christ, or pore over the profound wisdom of the philosophers in their study of man, "the glory, jest and riddle of the world," to be adequately aware that human psychology has envy as one of its universal and patent characteristics. Perhaps it was such an observation that led Hobbes to the false sociology founded on the principle that every man's hand is against his fellow. Envy is a perverse feeling, an untrue feeling, a vile feeling; but none of us is fully free from this darkness of the understanding and weakness of the will, this spiritual gene transmitted to us by our primeval ancestor, Adam. We may cut it back; but like the weeds of our lawns, it springs ever anew in the human breast where it has been seeded as the cockle of original sin.

Ecclesiastes (4:4) ponders this trait of the children of men: "Again I considered all the labors of men; and I remarked that their industries are exposed to the envy of their neighbor." Osanander at the time of Christ satirically portrays envy as "the pain of mind that successful men cause their neighbors." We are gracious and kind with interiors, natural and amiable with equals, but, in tendency if not also in fact, we are strangely hard and even vicious with those who surpass us. "He is weary of his earldom if there is a duke in the land," the Duke of Northumberland, Henry Percy, shrewdly admonishes his son. On a number of occasions, the great orator of Constantinople, St. John Chrysostom (A.D. 347-407) dwells on this illogical fact of human nature:

> So little a thing as this seems, to rejoice with them that rejoice, it still is exceedingly great and requireth the true spirit of wisdom . . . . For many weep with them that weep, but still do not rejoice with them that rejoice, and are in tears when others rejoice. Now this comes from grudging and envy . . . . There are many that have shared danger with others in danger, but were cut to the heart when those others came into honor. So great is the tyranny of a grudging spirit![1]

Not merely material success and values are envied, and not solely by the worldly-minded and irreligious. Spiritually successful activities and gifts are, far more commonly than is imagined, the object of insidious envy, and, strangely enough, of unconscious or even conscious nihilistic machination on the part of professionally spiritual persons, whose office it is, by every means in their power, to further God's glory and the good of souls. Too often the feet of the people encounter the stone of scandal thrown in their path by some officers of Christ's army who are saddened by its achievements because other officers than they have won the victories and led the advances. They cannot find in their cabined hearts to say magnanimously with the magnanimous St. Paul: "But what then? As long as by all means, whether by occasion or by truth, Christ be preached: in this also I rejoice, yea, and I will rejoice" (Phil.1:18). The magnetic pole of their thought and ambition is the notice and advantage they receive, not the notice and advantage that Christ receives. They do not remember that their Creator and Christ-King did not seek His own glory, while they His creatures and subjects, seek their own glory by hindering His glory in others. In no minced words St. John Chrysostom, excoriates those spiritually occupied of his time and of all time, who bore within to undermine their fellow apostle's influence:

> Thou indeed now killest not [like Cain]; but thou dost many things worse than murder, desiring that thy brother act unseemly, laying snares for him on all sides, paralysing his labors on the side of virtue,

---

[1] Homily 7 on the Epistle to the Romans, n. 6.

> grieving that he pleases the Master of the universe. Thou warrest not with they brother, but with Him Whom he serves; Him thou insultest when thou preferrest thy glory to His.[2]

So common is this envious self-centeredness that it is phenomenal to find a religious house or diocese in which malignant envy does not occasionally sink its teeth into the heel of a fellow religious or priest who is doughtily doing battle in the front line for the Kingdom. The intriguing spirit of the Byzantine court climbers had infiltrated into ecclesiastical and religious climbers; and the archiepiscopal shepherd, Chrysostom, battled vigorously against its demoralizing tactics:

> Men of this kind are fighting at the side of the Devil against the Church; and maybe they do worse . . . . We can be on our guard against such a one [an open enemy]; but these, disguising themselves under the mask of friendliness, secretly kindle a conflagration . . . . What evil has happened? Is it that thy brother is in honor, and looked up to, and in esteem? Why, thou oughtest to deck thyself with chaplets and rejoice and glorify God that thine own member is in honor and influential. Art thou pained that God is glorified? . . . . And why do I speak of thy brother? Even if he were thy foe and thine enemy, and God were glorified through him, a friend thou shouldst make of him for this reason. But thou,—dost thou consider thy friend thine enemy because God is glorified through his honor with the people? And were anyone to heal thy body in evil plight, though he were an enemy, thou wouldst count him thenceforward among the first of thy friends. And dost thou recokn him that gladdens the countenance of Christ's Body, the Church, and is thy friend, to be for this reason thine enemy?[3]

In general, it is acidulous envy which generates and exacerbates class war, whether racial, regional, religious, social or economic. "When envy breeds unkind division there comes ruin," is the observation of Shakespeare.[4] Communism, the perennial and greatest class war, has as its tap-root envy, infecting whatever of good may be in its violent theories. Envy of the "haves" is that which makes "have-not" Communism so senselessly destructive and so negative. Without envy, the Reds would lose most of their tremendous emotional drive. Often I have listened to soap-box orators in tolerant Hyde Park and on the swirling street corners of the United States, arguing the superiority and desirability of Communism with some attempt to be logical; but when emotion fired their eyes with cruel glint and embittered their invective damning of "the idle rich," then came the triumph of their oratory, shaking the souls of their impecunious hearers; then "they sharpened their tongues like a serpent, the venom of asps was under their lips" (Ps. 139:4).

---

[2] Homily 37 on St. John's Gospel, n. 3.

[3] Homily 7 on the Epistle to the Romans, n. 6.

[4] *King Henry VI*, First Part, Act IV, Scene 1.

Among nations envy has a large share of the responsibility for wars. Domestic war in families is even more the result of envy and jealousy. Painful, indeed, and unapproachable as a boil is the jealous member of a family. Parental envy at times selfishly suppresses the lives of the children in a sort of servitude to the parents. The ungenerous mother who cuts off the normal married life of a daughter, because of her refusal to allow another to have her daughter's love and attention is a common theme of story. Frequently, too, the self-important superior will not permit the normal expansion of the inferior's developing superiority. Cinderella, suppressed by her ill-favored sisters, is a classic because she is true to human life. Mr. Barrett of Wimpole Street, so jealous of his daughters' love that he could not suffer the idea of others enjoying it, is another of the many exemplifications of this human trait.

THE NATURE OF ENVY

Envy (Latin: *invidia*) and jealousy (Greek: ζῆλος) are often used interchangeably. When distinguished one from another in English, envy more commonly is displeasure at another's having material advantages, while jealousy is displeasure at his having esteem, love, notice, beauty, nobility, intelligence, or similar mental or emotional values. (As to the difference between the two words in Latin, consult the *Summa* of St. Thomas I-II g. 36, a. 2). The envious person may or may not have the goods envied; but he always wishes that the envied person be deprived of them, as St. Cyprian (A.D. 200-258) notes in his treatise *On Envy and Jealousy.* Envy, says St. John Baptist de la Salle in his *Les devoirs du chrétien,* "is criminal sorrow at the welfare of our neighbor."

To wish that we had what we see others have is not the vice of envy. When envious or jealous, we wish evil to others, desiring with a dog-in-the-manger perversity that they should not have the goods which they have, usually because we do not wish them to surpass or even to equal us. The golden tongued St. John asks:

> Wherefore grievest thou, O man, at the prosperity of thy neighbor? We ought to grieve at the ills we suffer, not because we see others in good repute. Hence this sin is stripped of all excuse. The fornicator may allege his lust, the thief his poverty, the manslayer his passion,—frigid excuses and unreasonable, but still excuses. But what reason, tell me, wilt thou name? . . . If we are commanded to love our enemies, what punishment shall we suffer, if we hate our friends?[5]

Envy would level the world about it, at least to its own plane, in those goods and qualities which it desires in itself. Dogs bark at human beings and the envious snarl at their betters. Hence Seneca in his *Hercules furens* teaches that "The first art of the ruler is to learn to endure envy." Like all spiritual abnormality, it is self-combative; for it proves that the merit, which it denies, really exists, as the clinging shadows proves the existence of the substance to which it adheres.

Cicero deplores that "it is the shame of this age that probity is envied." [6] But envy was not a monopoly of his age; it is the captious instinct of human nature itself to look on the goods of others as our evils, as St. Basil (A. D. 329-79) points out in his treatise *On Envy.* Hence one is most likely to be envious of those who excel in a phase of life in which he himself is anxious to excel. Hesiod noted this 700 years before Christ: "It is the potter that envies the potter . . . and the bard that envies the bard." Who will most probably seek to undo the influence of the learned man? Another learned man. We compete; we are beaten; and we cannot be good losers; so we are jealous. "Envy not the man that prospereth in his way" (Ps. 36:7).

THE SINFULNESS OF ENVY

The sinfulness of envy is primarily its rebellion against the Providence of God for our lives; only secondarily is it sinful because it is contrary to the love of our neighbor: "Charity envieth not." Malcontent envy refuses to accept God's infinitely good and wise arrangement whereby some should have what some have not. It is the mortified pride of Lucifer living on in the nature which he has tainted and rejecting the all-beneficent Will as to the circumstances and status in which by every possible claim we should each serve Him.

---

[5] Homily 37 on St. John's Gospel, n. 3.

[6] *For Balbus*, 6.

Envy is a capital sin because it is a capital human tendency and a universal temptation. It is also a capital source of many other sins, especially of hatred, slander and injustice. Envy committed the first murder. Envy is the venom sac of the fangs of hatred. Detraction, the telling of scandalous truth, has commonly the Luciferan tail of envy; and devastating detraction is *the* mortal sin of good people. Rarely, too, is there consistent injustice towards a person that is not rooted in envy of him. It was envy that led the brothers of Joseph of Egypt to decide to kill him, and when dissuaded from that, to sell him as a slave to the Egyptians. Pilate knew that for envy the Jewish religious leaders had delivered Christ (Matt. 27:18; Mark 15:10). In fact, Wisdom (2:24) makes envy the septic source of original sin and of all the world's evils: "By envy death came into the world."

The degree of gravity in the sin of envy is the extent to which we are opposed to God's careful Providence in His discriminating distribution of His gifts and in His arrangement of our kaleidoscopic life's events. This irritated opposition is usually measured by the degree of injury which we wish to befall the envied one. The seriousness of envy may also consist in the degree of good hindered by it. Thus jealousy, salting the spiritual wells of others' influence, is easily grievous. The self-esteemed spiritual person must be wisely watchful that he does not have to confess: "I have said my prayers and the Devil Envy said, Amen."[7]

Core, Dathon and Abiron (Numbers XVI), spiritual leaders amongst the Jewish people, envied Moses' leadership and professed principles of humility as a reason for leading a rebellion against Moses and Aaron, protesting: "Why lift you up yourselves above the people of the Lord?" God caused the earthquake to swallow up them and their families as a sign of His hatred of their insincere envy and of the selfish sedition which it instigated.

[7] *Troilus and Cressida,* Act II, Scene 1.

THE DESTRUCTIVENESS OF ENVY

"Jealousy is as cruel as the grave" says the Song of Solomon; and in its essential demolition of others and of itself, envy singularly manifests in itself the very essence of sin which is nowise constructive but wholly malignant in its utter destructiveness. Christopher Marlowe well represents it in *Dr. Faustus:* "I am envy . . . I cannot read and I wish all books burned. I am lean with seeing others eat." Envy has devilish malignity, angry that another is happy in some quality, possession or accomplishment; and in its bilious hatred of the good possessed or done by others, it will ruthlessly rob a life of its promising future, "as is the bud bit by an envious worm."[8]

Appalling is the amount of wrecked human endeavor in all fields becasue of the disintegrating sabotage of envious criticism and even by diabolic intrigue of persons who rate themselves as honorable and high-minded. Sad are the words needed to express "what might have been" but for the malice spread like withering salt over the productive fields and flowering gardens of lives "that the Lord has blessed." Too often a life, painfully won from the wilderness by the direst labor, tilled and weeded and fertilized with dogged constancy, planted at the expense of great privation and irrigated toilfully until it stands a flourishing field of extraordinary promise,—all has been ruined in a day by the pitiless consuming locusts of jealousy, leaving stark desolation where there was buoyant ambition and hope, ugliness where there was beauty, sorrow where there was joy. And withal, the devastator carries away nothing for himself beyond the sullen satisfaction of having destroyed.

"You get nothing out of it," as the phrase runs; for while seriously injuring others, envy injuries itself perhaps still more seriously. Experienced Job comments: "Envy killeth the little one"; it psychologically tears to pieces the small character, unhappy in the happiness of others. Envy shoots envenomed shafts at the stars and they fall back to sink into its own heart. It snarls and its snarling serves only to enjaundice itself. Piquant Horace notes this in his *Epistle to Lollius:* "Sicilian tyrants never invented a greater torment than envy." The emotional and mental self-destructivenss of jealousy is often the changeling of exaggerated possessiveness of love; but unless love resolutely hastens to suffocate this cherished monster, it will poison the parent.

---

[8] *Romeo and Juliet*, Act. I, Scene 1.

Only the Angel of the Passion has the shocked understanding, the heart-broken emotion, and the blazing eloquence fit to give tongue to the pity of the spiritual values nullified by the envy of the professionally spiritual person. The violence of the "golden tongued" of Byzance is exaggeration only for us who are not endowed with his keen vision and mystic love for the glory of the Most High:

> Even if a man do miracles, have celibacy to show, and fasting and lying on the bare ground, and doth by this virtue approach even to the angels, yet shall he be most accursed of all while he has this defect [envy], and he shall be a greater breaker of the law than the adulterer and the fornicator and the robber and the violator of sepulchers.
>
> And that none may condemn this language as hyperbole, I should be glad to put this question to you: If anyone were to come with fire and mattock, destroying and burning this church and tearing down this Altar, would not each of you here present stone him as accursed and lawless? What then if one were to bring a more consuming flame, I mean envy, that doth not ruin the stone buildings, nor tear down this Altar of gold, but overturneth and scornfully marreth that which is far more precious than walls or Altar, but destroys the Teacher's building,—what sufferance would he deserve? . . . Tell me, then, dost thou not perceive that thou art attacking the sheep of Christ when thou warrest against His Shepherd?—those sheep, indeed, for whom Christ shed His Blood and bade us both to do and suffer all things?"[9]

Pope St. Clement (A. D. 30-100), the disciple of St. Peter, asserts in his *First Letter to the Corinthians* that it was envy which had thrown the life of the Church of Corinth into confusion, strife and persecution. After citing examples of the effects of envy, he declares that both St. Peter and St. Paul suffered their many misfortunes because of envy, which thus opposed the development of the infant Church.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF ENVY

There is abnormal psychology and witless sophism underlying every vice. Basic to envy is the "inferiority complex," or some emotion manifested in the perverse and fallacious sense of loss in the mere fact of another's gain, the very common fallacy that we are great if another is less than we are, and *vice versa*.

---

[9] Homily 7 on the Epistle to the Romans, n. 6.

And instantly our forehead darkly lowers
As though another's merit lessened ours.

Under the emotional perturbation of an envious mind, we refuse to consent to factual perfection in others; we resentfully ascribe merited praise of them, and the praised good done by them, to sinister motives.

So powerful is jealousy in throwing our thinking askew, that it is often one of the principal delusions of paranoia, a form of insanity in which emotion leads one to think that he himself, his situation in life, and the effects of others on him, are entirely different from what they are in reality; the so-called "flight from reality." In general, insanity that is functional arises from uncontrolled yielding to emotional tendencies to satisfy unbalanced instincts; and it manifests itself in fantastic reactions to frustration of this satisfaction.

Jealousy as a delusion may be "competitive jealousy," in which the unbalanced person thinks absurdly that others with great power and advantages are viciously striving to deprive him of something that he possesses or seeks. This delusion of jealousy easily slips over into the delusion of being systematically persecuted.

A second form is "projected jeaolusy," in which the abnormally jealous mind is emotionally convinced that others are insanely jealous of him, thus "projecting" his own jealousy into others. For the thief, everyone is a thief; and the accusation of jealousy comes very readily into the mind and speech of the jealous person; the more readily and intensely, the greater the unbalance of the emotions.

The third form is "paranoid jealousy," in which a whole interlocked system of delusions is assembled to justify unreasonable jealousy. It even fictions false memories of past incidents to give grounds and explanations for the jealousy, to "rationalize" it. All these forms of jealousy in the insane have corresponding milder forms in the sane.

THE CURE FOR ENVY

Obviously, the antidote for envy is, primarily, confident acquiescence to God's paternal designs and wise intentions for our lives and ready acceptance of the apparently fortuitous circumstances in which He intends us to serve and glorify Him. His Will is that we energetically better our persons and condition in every licit way; and thus, becoming a greater glory in ourselves, we more greatly glorify our Creator-Lord for Whom entirely we exist. But whatever be the results of our efforts to perfect ourselves in every and any way, He wishes us to glorify Him in the still more important way of accepting unreservedly those results in passive conformity with His all-wise and all-good Will. Thus we not only please God in the highest possible way but we also develop our earthly and heavenly grandeur of character, if, in a spirit of filial content with our Father's Will for us, we often make interior acts of sincere joy at the glory of God realized in the welfare and excellence of others with whom we come into comparison in any way, especially when we, in contrast to them, have appeared inferior. "Envy no man's happiness, glad of other men's good."[10]

The only way of conquering superiority in others is love: love of God's Providence for men, and love of our neighbor's welfare, "preferring one another in honor" (Rom. 12:10). It is this magnanimity of soul much more than increase of temporal goods, as sociologists might well note, which will make fretful, selfish, mankind contended. Worldly goods and success are only too likely to bring discontent where there was relative content before. The "contention as to who would be the greatest" rose among the lowly apostles, not when they were of no consequence, but only when there was a prospect of their sitting on twelve thrones (Luke 22:30).

Instead of weeping at those who rejoice in their gifts or success, we are, according to the Apostle, "to rejoice with those that rejoice and weep with those who weep" (Rom. 12:15); and this is no mere truism, but a much-needed counsel for beautiful human living and for inspiring Christian character. It is, moreover, the counsel of sane psychology:

> Let us by all means tear up envy by the roots, considering this: as we offend God when we waste away with envy at other men's blessings, so when we rejoice with them, we are well pleasing to Him, and render

---

[10] *As You Like It,* Act III, Scene 2.

ourselves partakers of the good things laid up for the righteous. Therefore, Paul exhorteth to "rejoice with them that rejoice and weep with them that weep" that in both ways we may gain great profit.[11]

FRANCIS J. MCGARRIGLE, S.J.

Seattle College,
Seattle, Wash.

[11] St. John Chrysostom, Homily 37 on St. John's Gospel, n. 3.

"SO WALK . . . "

The rules of modesty must be observed even in our movements, gestures, and gait. The attitude of the body reveals the condition of the mind. Our inner man is judged by our gestures: "That one is a frivolous, loud, and boastful fellow" men say, or else: "He is steady, firm, upright, dependable." Thus the movements of the body are the voice of the soul.

You remember, my sons, a certain friend of ours, who seemed to be anxious to recommend himself by his assiduity, but was not admitted by me into the clerical order because of the extreme unseemliness of his gestures. You remember also that I told another cleric, whom I found already here, that he was never to walk in front of me. The arrogance of his gait was like a whiplash across my eyes. I told him, when he returned to his duties after some offence, and that was the only criticism I made. But my judgment did not deceive me. Both those men have now left the Church. What their gait betrayed them to be, such were they proved to be by the faithlessness of their hearts. The one abandoned the faith at the time of the Arian troubles; the other through love of money denied that he was one of us, so that he might not have to appear before the episcopal court. Their worthlessness was reflected in their walk, for they really looked like a pair of strolling clowns. . . .

A proper gait is one in which there is an appearance of authority and weight and dignity and tranquility. It should be perfectly simple and plain, without any affectation or conceit.

— St. Ambrose, *De Officiis Ministrorum,* I, 18.

SOME RECENT NOVELS IN CATHOLIC PERSPECTIVE

However one may interpret the phenomenon, religion is occupying a prominent place in the realm of "best seller" fiction. Although the nature of the religion described by these popular forms of mass appeal may be faulty, the stress laid on the spiritual is not altogether without significance. In looking for this significance it must be admitted that it is not too difficult a task to criticize these books ruthlessly. All too often there is complete failure to understand what Catholicism is or teaches. Frequently enough there is only the faintest comprehension of what religion itself is, or in what spiritual reality consists. In general, too, the over-preoccupation of some purveyors of fiction with sex or, as it is called, "realism," lays their work open to severe and all too justifiable a censure from the standpoint of Catholic moral principles. Yet, granting these glaring and often deplorable deficiencies, some of these best sellers and popular works of fiction are positive manifestations of a search and a heightened spiritual awareness that a priest ought not to ignore.

Two recent novels fall into this last-mentioned class. Both are the products of first-class craftsmen. Both concern themselves with what may be described as a spiritual quest. One is Aldous Huxley's *Time Must Have a Stop;*[1] the other is Somerset Maugham's *The Razor's Edge.*[2] In bringing these two books together, however, there is no intention of implying that they are on the same level, for that they assuredly are not; nor is there any implied judgement that both are of equal value and interest, for they are not. What unites them is a basic concern which both manifest, and it is that basic concern that gives them their interest here.

The author of *Time Must Have a Stop*, Aldous Huxley, is a man of both breadth and depth in reading and culture. His prose style is forceful and his ability to delineate modern society and modern problems in vivid and striking phrase is memorable. In depicting and satirizing, in his other novels, modern society and contemporary social panaceas, no one has shown so graphically the emptiness, futility, and disaster inherent in that structure. Yet, while stripping away the falsity of the answers advanced for the problems of man and society, these novels have also given evidence of being expositions of the author's own search for the ultimate reality that can give sense to this life or, at least, make it bearable.

---

[1] New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1944.

[2] New York: Doubleday, Doran and Co., Inc., 1944.

In this book Mr. Huxley comes more clearly to grips with the fundamental problem that has been perceptibly emerging in his writing: in the face of the miseries of the world, the pathetic futility of organizing society on the basis of power alone, the self-imposed imprisonment of lust, what can give reality, vitality, and meaning to life? In his answer lies the core of this novel. His central character, Sebastian Barnack, is limned in a canvas of characters that are concrete manifestations of the forces entering into human life. There is depicted the sensual, yet appreciative and companionable, pagan in his Uncle Eustace, who with death discovers the prison chamber his lust and irresponsible life have built. The type of the selfless but professional social planner whose life is pathetic and frustrate is drawn for us in his father. Veronica Thwale is the representation of the unprincipled cult of shamelessness. Finally, we have the decisive influence in the character of Bruno Rontini, who embodies that force in which, Sebastian is convinced, the elements of a solution lie. He is the spiritual man who realizes that what is required is "the sacrifice of self-will in order to make room for the knowledge of God." Out of this interplay of human elements comes the last chapter in which the mature Sebastian induces a working hypothesis for a solution.

Succinctly, though not comprehensively, Sebastian's tentative answer to the problem of life and its defects may be stated as the liberation from sorrow through the direct intellectual intuition of what he terms the "Divine Ground," or the "Godhead." The nature of this intuition is analyzed with power and force if not always with clarity. There is the realization that the sheer world refusal of Brahmanism or Buddhism cannot be made palatable for the European or American, while at the same time he maintains that Christianity can never be accepted by the Asiatic majority. Consequently he feels that some form of "shared theology" is required. Exactly in what this sharing will consist is not made clear. Nor, as Sebastian himself notes, is it clear as to what the relationship between the Godhead and the personal God is.

Thus the only hypothetical surety that he would see arising from his analysis would be that the answer lies in a liberation from this world and its appearances. Only the Eternal Reality can "neutralize the destructive energies of ambition, covetousness, and love of power." The process by which this deliverance is attained is a process of intellectual intuition and discipline whereby one can know, love, and become actually identified with this mystically apprehended Absolute. This process calls for a self-obliterating transcendence of individual separateness and all that is connoted by the term personality. In essence, then, though he employs the experience of the Christian mystics, the answer adhered to has it roots in the oriental spiritual attitude that would be freed from the manifold miseries of existence by so turning from history and individual awareness that personal identity ceases and identification with the undifferentiated Spirit begins.

This basically oriental solution to the life of the spirit is also that proposed by the main character in *The Razor's Edge.* In fact, the chief difference between the two books is very much the difference between the two authors. Both writers are subtle and interesting and both have a carefully cultivated impersonality in their books. But there the likeness ceases. Mr. Maugham is the dispassionate observer, the self-styled reporter of peoples' lives and no more. He writes competently but with none of the controlled fire and essential seriousness of Mr. Huxley. His attitude is a good example of the modern pagan's life, "a professional activity unaccompanied by sustained religious experience or inward discipline, without sense of responsibility or sin." So Mr. Maugham merely describes what he sees and does not enter into it. Hence, though the present novel deals basically with a religious quest, it certainly gives no indication of being a personal issue with him. He feels no responsibility for the failures or successes of those whom he draws. If they are cruel or mean or vicious or sensual or lustful, it is chiefly a matter of heredity or environment. For him sin is a mutable social sanction, not a personal fact. Thus, his story of a religious quest lacks both power and conviction.

The dominant theme that unites the various characters and incidents into a fairly coherent whole is indicated by the subtitle of the novel, "The Story of a Man Who Found a Faith." The man who finds a faith is Laurence Elliott, whose quest for faith began with his experience as a flyer in the last war. As he formulates his own problem: "I want to make up my mind whether God is or God is not. I want to find out why evil exists. I want to find out whether I have an immortal soul or whether when I die it is the end."

In the course of his search he comes into contact with Catholicism and spends three months at a German monastery. But to him Catholicism is not the answer. He sees it as too tied up with the world of the present existence, with the idea of personal responsibility for sin. He finds it too anthropomorphic in its insistence on prayer and worship. In short, religion and God as revealed are alien to his conceptions of what the relationship of man to the Absolute ought to be. His failure to see Catholicism would seem to stem from the fact that he is dictating how the transcendent God ought to reveal Himself.

Having dismissed Catholicism on these grounds, Elliott comes into contact with the religious thought of India. Here he discovers a faith that he feels he can live by. In this religious solution, achieved through the medium of intellectual contemplation and the physico-historical medium of re-incarnation, he discovers what he deems is a possible answer to his search. Yet it is apparent that, even to him, this form of spirituality is not so much a solution as a possibility of liberation from a society dominated by a conscious lust for pleasure or power or wealth.

In essence the Indian religious answer is a spiritual monism, an identification of the individual soul with the "Absolute Spiritual Reality" transcending the order of nature and all limited forms of existence. At its center this particular form of deliverance is a refusal of life. Existence is evil, consciousness is evil. Hence both must be left behind and man, through contemplation and the cycles of rebirth, must return to the "one, absolute and undifferentiated Being, or Not-Being, of which his spirit is a part."

Thus, each in his own way, these two spiritual quests come to the same general conclusion. None the less, each solution is seen to be of a tentative nature. The reason for this hesitation is quite marked. Both fictional protagonists are too much a part of the Western tradition to refuse life altogether. Both are too conscious of the social aspects of life to refuse to be concerned with its elevation and spiritualization. Each, therefore, is seeking to bring this Eternal Reality into some real and transforming relation with the life of men, since they refuse to be fully convinced that life is wholly appearence and illusion. It is on this tentative and still questing note that their search ends.

By way of critique and evaluation from a Catholic standpoint several points may be noted. Prescinding from the casually pornographic upon which some of the incidents border, some religious factors come into view. First, as Christopher Dawson has pointed out, it is empirically discernible in history that when a civilization has become mature and become fully conscious of its failings, strifes, and miseries, this turning to some form of spiritual monism is always in evidence, be it in India, China, Greece, or the later Roman world. Secondly, in both of the books it is quite evident that the unique historical aspect of Christianity is completely overlooked. For Christianity is the divine spiritual order incarnated into an historical person and an historical society. Through Christ, the divine has entered into history, and history itself is a vehicle of the divine purpose. In this same regard the great historical fact of original sin—the wrecking of humanity at its very beginning through the sacrifice of God to self and its perpetuation and renewal in each case of actual sin—is ignored. Finally, there is mention but no appreciation of the power of God unto salvation which we call grace. The redeeming work of Christ, bringing into the world this new and supernatural life, has given men the power to transmute and renew the whole of life. The Divine Spirit is the actuating principle of this life which is capable of regenerating and re-creating mankind. It is that love of God building up through history the City of God. So that, without turning from life and existence, without losing his own nature, man lives by the Divine life, sees and loves with the knowledge and love of God. The Christian is perfectly aware that one cannot be quit of nature on such easy terms as the oriental would have it, for he knows with St. Irenaeus that, "since men are real theirs must be a real restoration. They do not vanish into non-existence but progress among existing things."

An interesting, though not memorable, contribution, to the appreciation of the struggle of Catholicism in Nazi Germany is Thomas Kernan's recent novel, *Now With The Morning Star.*[3] He writes of a phase of the Nazi religious persecution which in the past has been painted in flamboyant colors. He deals with the experience of a man who, after twenty years as a monk, is set adrift in Germany when the Nazis seize the monastery.

Well-knit and smoothly written, the narrative is a descriptive one, occasionally illumined by flashes of insight. Rich dramatic possibilities are offered by a situation in which a man is wrenched out of the silence and solitude of a Cistercian abbey and thrust into the midst of a Germany preparing for war and rigidly controlling and supervising every phase of life for the good of the State. The personal adjustment to such a state of affairs, the struggle for the necessities of life, the difficulties of the Church in continuing, even on a reduced scale, its religious activities, all these become vivid and clear in the course of the narrative.

The climax of the story comes when Andreas is arrested for smuggling currency into Germany for the use of the Church. Tried and sentenced, he finally arrives back at his old abbey, now a German labor camp. Here he takes up the essentials of his old life, even to inhabiting his old cell. Though he has an opportunity to escape, he determines to remain because as long as he remains he keeps alive the spirit that built the abbey.

Although well drawn, the characters never come fully to life. Also, the motivation for remaining in the prison, while present, is not as convincing as it might be. However, Catholics will read it with interest, and non-Catholics may be enabled to get some glimpse of the interior core of a religious life.

* * * * *

Every novelist, insofar as he creates his characters and their situations, is somewhat akin to Hardy's "President of the Immortals." It is when the characters become too much like puppets that a novel loses its lasting value, and it is from this defect that A. J. Cronin's latest novel, *The Green Years,*[4] patently suffers. He generates sympathy for his hero by so painting situation and incident that he is in constant travail. All the good will, talent, sensitivity, and vision with which he endows Robert Shannon are constantly thwarted by misunderstanding and sheer meanness. When people do not suffice he floors him with a bout of diphtheria, thus making sure that he will not get his coveted desire to study medicine. When the opportunity does come it is like a regular script writer's *deus ex machina*, serving to discomfit Robert's opponents at the same time.

---

[3] New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944.

[4] Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1944.

Catholicism plays a part in the life of Robert but the teaching that is described certainly would move to neither love nor appreciation. His subsequent loss of faith (another trial by the way) is not too difficult to understand. His return to the faith is hardly satisfactory, to say nothing of being convincing. Canon Roche's admonition to believe in God blindly and flee from any intellectual approach seems to have helped him considerably, but the result is a blind feeling about God that seems to reside in his blood and marrow, and avoids the intellect with great care.

Perhaps it's a question of personal prejudice, but it seems to this writer that if you took an Horatio Alger character and gave him a slight power of self-analysis, some sense of economic and social pressures and divergencies, painted his opponents and situations in practically unrelieved black, and then poured the whole into an interesting and fairly easy prose style, the product would be a novel like this present one. Admittedly the end-result is a workmanlike job, but it is neither noteworthy nor "distinguished" as the advertisements insist on telling us.

* * * * *

Judging by the amount and kind of advertising that is being lavished on Kathleen Winsor's *Forever Amber*,[5] it will be in the best seller lists for many a day. It's popular appeal will really be its sex appeal. As to being a first class novel, any such resemblance is purely coincidental. Take a character with no redeeming traits and put her in a fictional squirrel cage of Restoration costumes, dialogue, and personalities, plus a career of casual fornication, adultery, and intrigue, then whirl the cage 975 times and you have Amber forever.

[5] New York: The Macmillan Co., 1944.

If asked to criticize it one could say that not only does it make a scandalous story extremely boring and absurd but it offends good taste, the canons of literature and Christian morals.

EUGENE M. BURKE, C.S.P.

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the January, 1895, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* Father Thomas Hughes, S.J., writes the first of a series of articles on "The Library of a Priest." He makes the wise comment that it is better to deliver ourselves unto the guidance of a few excellent books than to lead a vagrant life among many. . . . Father Arthur Barry O'Neill, C.S.C., writing from St. Joseph, New Brunswick, discusses the need of daily meditation in the priestly life. (If he were writing this article today he could quote in support of his theme pronouncements of Popes and a prescription of the Code [Can. 125, § 2]). . . . A certain "Quirinus," writing on the activities of the Catholic clergy in politics, mentions that in Spain the clergy are divided in their adherence to Don Carlos, on the one hand, and the reigning house of Alfonso XIII, represented by the Queen Regent, his mother. (Little did the boy monarch then dream that one day he would be driven from his throne and from his beloved Spain, to die in exile). . . . A question about persons who, by order of the physician, eat meat on abstinence days in Advent elicits the answer that flesh and fish are not allowed at the same meal for those who are dispensed from the abstinence. (How much more lenient than previous legislation are the laws of the Code regarding fast and abstinence! In the old days fast always included abstinence; the use of fish and meat at the same meal, even on Sundays in Lent, was forbidden; and in many dioceses the Fridays of Advent were fast days). . . . A brief anonymous article comments on a recent instruction from the Holy See to the bishops, condemning explicitly three secret societies—the Odd Fellows, the Sons of Temperance and the Knights of Pythias. (Membership in these societies is still *per se* gravely sinful; however, by virtue of more recent concessions of the Holy See, purely passive membership on the part of those who joined in good faith can be allowed under certain conditions.)

F. J. C.

VENI DE LIBANO

Prescinding for the moment from the horrors of the war, American Catholics have reason to think they are living in happy times. The Liturgical Movement is in full career under our very eyes. Every period in the history of the Church has its bright era, and so, in the designs of Divine Providence, it is our privilege at the present time to have our attention centered on a deeper appreciation of Holy Mass. This widespread rekindling of interest in the Catholic Prayerbook, the Roman Missal, is destined to enrich our own lives and help us to renew the face of the earth.

By a happy coincidence, if not actually as a result of this movement, translation of the Bible, too, has entered a new phase. For several decades past, many minds in our midst have been engaged in this noble work, and it is a pleasure and encouragement to see how warmly the recent encyclical on biblical studies commends these efforts.

One of the chief objects of Catholic scholars in dealing with translation of the Bible at the present moment is to bring it "within the reach" of the people. This is accomplished by proper modernization. A good translation must grip the attention of the common man of today; it must lure him to a second and third and ever-renewed reading. If it does not do that, it is, to that extent, "beyond his reach." He knows the Bible, and yet is a stranger to it. Modes of expression that were direct and striking a hundred years ago when they came from the pen of an earlier translator, necessarily lose some of their freshness through constant repetition, quite apart from the fact that words change their meaning, or at least their connotation, in course of time. It has, therefore, been truly said that "there cannot be in the nature of the case any such thing as a permanent translation. It is a work which will require constant re-doing."[1] Modernization is, therefore, a constant process. Each age has its own ideals of language that is up-to-date.

But modernization has its limits, too. "I deem it highly improper," says Pope St. Gregory the Great, "to bring the Word of

---

[1] Cf. William Hardy Alexander, "Adaptative Translation of the Classics," *The Classical Journal*, XXXVIII (1943), 6, pp. 337–46.

God into harmony with the rules of Donatus."[2] As a matter of fact, the simple, unadorned narratives of the Gospels, for instance, would show very badly in the polished diction or the exquisite rhythms of, say, a Cardinal Newman. And as for the speeches recorded in the Gospels, it would, of course, be absurd to make uneducated people speak like noble lords and ladies. And yet, simple as this principle appears to be, there is need of caution even here. It has been observed that the native speech of uneducated persons is likely to abound in racy, virile locutions. The Evangelists were uneducated in the modern sense of the term; and yet, how often do we not come across some pregnant phrase which we cannot help admiring for its striking quality! Furthermore, whenever they introduce our Lord as the speaker, whether He spoke to ordinary people or to the learned Pharisees, it is well to remember that, though He had no rabbinical training, yet He could, and no doubt did, make even homely words striking and unforgettable by His *ethos* which never left Him, or by His *pathos* when the occasion required it, or by the intonation of His voice or the facial expression that accompanied them. Of this fact we have innumerable instances in the Gospels. It is these finer qualities of speech, these undertones of His utterances, that the modern translator tries to capture.

To a modern translator, this quest of the *mot juste* is an ever-present cause of anxiety. Let me give an illustration. Verse 9 of Psalm 33 reads in the Latin: "*Gustate* et videte quoniam *suavis* est Dominus." In the context[3] the Psalmist mentions God's "goodness" and "kindness" as grounds for future confidence in Him. Modern translators, therefore, substitute the adjectives "good" or "kind" or "gracious" for the Douay rendering "sweet."[4] Their reason for doing so is that the former words are better suited to the original context, whereas "sweet" is overworked in modern romantic literature. This sounds plausible; but what is a translator to do when he finds this verse in the Mass in honor of the Little Flower (October 3), which is one of the tenderest in the entire Missal? Is he to regard the original context as decisive and substitute "good" or "kind" or "gracious"? Or, may he not choose to retain "sweet" as being just the word in the new context? The Psalmist asks us to "taste" (*gustate*), "quoniam *suavis* est Dominus." I think, therefore, that we are almost driven to render "sweet" under the circumstances. And quite apart from these considerations, if "sweet" is overdone in secular literature, is it therefore to be banished once for all from divine?

---

[2] "Indignum vehementer existimo, ut verba caelestis oraculi restringam sub regulis Donati." *Mor. in Job*, prooemium, cap. 5.

[3] Cf. Vander Heeren, *Psalmi et Cantica* (Bruge: Beyaert, 1924), p. 294.

[4] Cf. George O'Neill, S.J., *The Psalms and the Canticles of the Divine Office* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1937).

It seems clear, then, that lucidity of diction and presentation in the crisp language of everyday, in addition to correctness of interpretation, are the goals to be striven for if the common man of today is expected to take a more than ordinary interest in the Bible. In the present paper I am happy, therefore, that I can call attention to an important work on the Canticle of Canticles, which was designed by its author for this very purpose of making the old Hebrew marriage song acceptable to modern ears and taste. I mean *Das Hohelied, übersetzt und erklärt von Joseph Hontheim, S. J.*[5]

This distinguished philosopher, theologian, and biblical scholar explains the principle which guided him in his new translation, as follows:

> My translation aims, above all, at being understandable. After all, translations are made to make the original understood. Some figures of Hebrew speech are less familiar and less pleasing to German feeling than they were to the first readers of the Canticle. It is our business, therefore, to make them intelligible and thus remove what may be objectionable. Of course, fidelity of translation must not be sacrificed in the process. The thoughts, which we express in a manner intelligible and unobjectionable to ourselves, must be the very thoughts which the original intended to convey. It is in this fidelity to a writer's thoughts that fidelity of translation consists, and not in a slavish rendering.

With some hesitation I now subjoin a modern English rendering of the first seven stanzas of the Canticle, modelled entirely upon the German of Father Hontheim. I must ask the reader, however, to take the *correctness* of the German scholar's version for granted, for the point I wish to make in this paper is not to offer a new interpretation of the songs in question, but merely to let the reader see how courageously this scholar set himself the task of speaking in understandable language. The author may be mistaken, for all I know, in interpreting certain Hebrew idions; but to me, at any rate, the modern tone of his rendering is refreshing. This tone, it will be noticed, is not a hundred per cent modern; for every now and then the Hebrew flavor crops out. This, however, is to be expected. We meet with the same difficulty in rendering even the Gospels into modern English. Scholars who wish to obtain a thorough grasp of a Greek, or Latin, or Hebrew original, do not turn to a translation, no matter how perfect it may be said to be.

---

[5] *Biblische Studien* (Freiburg: Herder, 1908).

I must warn the reader that I have paid no attention to the Hebrew metrics as discussed by Father Hontheim in Chapter VIII of his *Prolegomena* and, so far as I can see, applied by him to his own rendering. Occasionally it will be found that the number of accented words or syllables in an English *stichos* is the same as that in the corresponding German model; but such coincidence is more or less accidental. Much useful information on Hebrew versification can be found in several papers contributed by Fathers Cummins and McClellan to the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* (III: 27 ff; 203 ff; 321 ff). An ancient composition that is *rhythmical* should, it seems to me, be presented in a *rhythmical* translation; but it does not follow that an ancient *metrical* scheme with all its intricacies should be retained in a modern English translation. It is enough to produce a general impression of rhythm, as distinct from prose, that will appeal to a modern reader. After all, the complicated ancient metres have no counterpart in modern poetry. Such attempts at transplanting this exotic feature into modern speech as have now and then been made are not very encouraging.

The Song of Songs, composed by Solomon

1, 2 Let me taste the kiss of thy friendship,
for sweeter than wine is thy love.
3 Thou art like the flavor of ointments;
thy very name is like sweet-scented oil.
The love of maidens is thy rightful reward.
4 Take me along with thee, and let us hasten,
and into thy chambers conduct me, O king.

There will we rejoice and be happy in thee;
there sing of thy love far sweeter than wine;
for thou hast a right to be loved.

5 Swarthy I am, yet am I comely still,
O daughters of Jerusalem.
I am swarthy like the maidens of Kedar,
and like to a Salmian girl.

6 O, pay no attention to the hue that is swarthy,
for the sunshine has colored my skin.
My brothers—they treated me sternly,
and sent me their vineyards to keep;
and to my own complexion I have given no heed.

7 Tell me, O thou whom my soul is enamored:
where art thou wont to pasture thy flocks?
where to recline at the noontime?
that I may not run hither and thither, inquiring
from thy partners who are with their flocks.

In a paper contributed to this *Review* for June, 1944, I submitted sufficient detail to clarify my point of view in translating the Gospels into modern speech. Much that was said there applies likewise to the Old Testament, only that here the retention of the flavor of the original makes heavier demands on the translator.

To round out the present paper I am appending a new version of the variable parts of the Mass in honor of the Little Flower. It was this Mass that, by its beautiful and even tender Introit, directed my attention to Fr. Hontheim's work on the Canticle of Canticles. It will be noticed that my translation of the Hebrew song follows essentially the same principles that I followed in dealing with the Gospels. The Liturgy is so steeped in biblical language that a principle found workable in the translation of the Bible must, of necessity, be workable also in that of the Liturgy. There is this difference, however, that, while the Gospels call for prose pure and simple, the poetical portions of the Old Testament demand more rhythm than is permissible in unadorned prose.[6]

---

[6] Cf. "Towards an English Translation of the Roman Missal," *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* CIX, 6 (Dec. 1943), pp. 443 ff.

Mass in Honor of St. Teresa of the Child Jesus

Introit: *Canticle of Canticles 4:8-9*

Come away[7] from Lebanon, my spouse! Come, O come away from Lebanon! Thou hast wounded my Heart, my sister spouse, thou hast wounded my Heart.

Ps. 112:1. Praise, O children, the Lord: praise the name of the Lord!

Collect:

Let us pray; O Lord, Thou hast declared: "Unless you become like little children, you will not enter the Kingdom of heaven." Enable us, we beg, with humility and simplicity of heart so to follow in the footsteps of the virgin Saint Teresa as to obtain the enternal rewards.

Epistle: *Isaias 66:12-14*

Thus says the Lord: "Mark what I say! I will divert from its channel a river of peace to her (i. e. Sion; the devout soul), and the glory of the Gentiles like an overflowing stream, which you shall drink. You shall be carried at the breast and fondled upon the knees. As when a mother caresses her darling. So will I comfort you, and in Jerusalem you shall be consoled. You will come to know this, and your heart shall rejoice, and, like herbs in their verdure, your bodies shall flourish. Thus shall her servants feel the hand of the Lord."

Gradual: *Matthew 11:25*

I praise Thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, for hiding these things from the wise and prudent, and revealing them to little ones.

Ps. 70:5. O Lord, my Hope Thou art from my childhood days.

Alleluia, alleluia. *Ecclesiasticus 39: 17-19.* Thrive like the rosebush planted on the brink of running waters! Like Lebanon[8] be laden with sweet scents! Blossom, O flowers, like the lily; breathe out a sweet perfume; bud forth with comely grace! Intone a hymn of praise, and bless the Lord in all His works! Alleluia.

---

[7] "Come away" is, I think, Fr. Martindale's happy suggestion. The bride is invited to leave, to come away from, her home in the Lebanon, and join the royal suitor in his palace. In the original setting, Mt. Lebanon is pictured as a place weird and wild. The Little Flower, on the contrary, grew up in a Christian home, redolent of the fragrant cedar and frankincense. Whatever was her sanctity at any time in her life, she was invited by her divine Bridegroom "ascendere superius."

[8] The Missal prints *Libanus* with a capital. This is a grander conception than if (with A Lapide and others) we explain *libanus* as the Greek word for "frankincense." So the current versions.

Tract: *Canticle of Canticles 2:11-12*

At last the winter has retreated, the rain has gone and passed away. Flowers have appeared in our land: the time of pruning is nigh: our land is musical with the voice of the turtledove.

Jeremias 31:3. With never-ending love have I loved thee: therefore did I take pity on thee and draw thee to myself.

In Paschal Time: *Ecclesiasticus 29:17-19*

Alleluia, alleluia. Thrive like the rosebush planted on the brink of running waters! Like Lebanon be laden with sweet scents! Blossom, O flowers, like the lily; breathe out a sweet perfume; bud forth with comely grace! Intone a hymn of praise, and bless the Lord in all His works! Alleluia.

Ps. 33:9; 99:5. Taste, and find that the Lord is sweet:[9] His mercy endures for evermore. Alleluia.

Gospel: *Matthew 18:1-4*

It was on this occasion that the disciples came up to Jesus and said to Him: "Who, really, is the greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven?" Jesus then called a little child to Him; set it in front of them, and said: "I tell you frankly, if you do not change and become like little children, you will not enter the Kingdom of Heaven. You see, then, he who like this little child, makes little of himself is the greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven."

Offertory: *Luke 1:46-48.49*

My soul extols the Lord, and my spirit sings for joy in God my Savior; for graciously He has looked upon the littleness of His lowly maid: sublime is what He, the Mighty One, has wrought in me.

Silent Prayer:

We beg, O Lord, that the holy prayer of Saint Teresa, Thy virgin, may make our sacrifice pleasing to Thee; and as it is offered with due solemnity in her honor, so may it win Thy acceptance by her merits.

Communion Verse: *Deuteronomy 32: 10-12*

He shepherded her, and instructed her: and He guarded her like the apple of His eye. Like an eagle He spread His wings and caught her up on high, and on His pinions He bore her away. The Lord has been her only Guide.

---

[9] For "sweet" in preference to "good; kind; gracious," cf. *supra*, p. 32.

Postcommunion:

Let us pray: O Lord, may the heavenly Mystery inflame us with the same fire of love with which Saint Teresa, Thy virgin, dedicated herself to Thee as a victim of charity for all mankind.

The Bible and the Liturgy are the two rules of our faith—the Bible inspired by God, and the Liturgy inspired by the Church as a practical compendium of Tradition. In a religious point of view, these two documents are the peak of literature. They can have no rivals among the literatures of the world. Should we not use the utmost care in presenting Bible and Liturgy to the common man of today in a manner to catch his eye, appeal to his imagination, and rivet his mind? For thus only will he *live* by them. "Man *lives* by every word that issues from the mouth of God."

JAMES A. KLEIST, S.J.

St. Louis University,
St. Louis, Mo.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC TRADITION

Archbishop Spalding had always believed in the infallibility of the Pope. This belief was a tradition with the Maryland Catholics, fostered and rendered stronger by the Jesuit fathers, who for so many years were their only religious teachers. His fathers had taken this faith with them to Kentucky. It was the doctrine which he had received from Flaget and David. Neither the Catholics of Maryland nor their descendants in Kentucky were tainted with even a tinge of Gallicanism. Indeed, it may be affirmed that, as far as we have a tradition in this country, it is thoroughly orthodox. It is the special pride of the American Church that it has not only been faithful to the Vicar of Christ, but has ever had for him the tenderest devotion.

"Thank God," wrote Archbishop Spalding to Cardinal Cullen in 1866, just after the close of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore—"thank God, we are Roman to the heart."

—Bishop John Lancaster Spalding, in *The Life of the Most Rev. M. J. Spalding*, D.D. (New York and San Francisco: Catholic Press Association Publishing Co. [1876]), pp. 381 f.

CATHOLIC POPULATION AGAIN

In the May issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* Fathers Kelly and Coogan grappled with the formidable, perennial problem of "What is Our Real Catholic Population?" In an effort to establish a satisfactory estimate of the Catholic population in the United States as of 1940, the authors applied the general birth rate of each diocesan area to the annual number of Catholic infant baptisms reported in that area, and derived mathematically sound totals of what the Catholic population should be in every one of the dioceses. By adding up these figures, they obtained the gratifying grand total of 33,000,000 for the Catholic population of the nation as a whole. To check this national figure, the authors compared it with the results of the "fertility-proportion" method, the "life-expectancy" method and the "population-birth proportion," and found their estimate sufficiently substantiated in each case. Hence, they concluded that "a Catholic population of 33,000,000 is to be favored, rather than an estimate of 23,000,000" (the death rate estimate), or the still lower *Catholic Directory* estimate of 22,000,000.[1]

There is much valuable material in this study; and the authors' figure of 33,000,000 has a more scientific basis than other estimates in this field have had in the past. However, if the authors set out to prove the death rate estimate and the *Catholic Directory* estimate inaccurate, and to work out a practical formula for computing the real Catholic population of the country, they should not have left out of consideration one important factor in that population. This omission, in my opinion, considerably reduces the scientific value of their computation and thus makes it merely another doubtful estimate.

I am not concerned here with the dubious need of discounting the estimate by reason of a possibly higher birth rate among Catholics than among non-Catholics, since the authors themselves have so discounted their derived estimate by an arbitrary 3,000,000 at the end of their article, even though they previously observed that "the Catholic birth rate has declined in recent years, so that now it approximates the non-Catholic birth rate."[2]

---

[1] Cf. *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* CX, 5 (May 1944), pp. 377, 373.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 369.

What I have in mind is another more obvious factor, which nevertheless seems invariably to elude those who correlate "Catholic" births with birth rates. The authors of the study under discussion leave it out of their calculations entirely, thus rendering even their discounted figure of 30,000,000 subject to correction.

We note that all their computations involve the admittedly accurate total of 550,000 infant baptisms of Catholics reported in that one year. In fact, the authors make that one figure, or the diocesan portions of it, the starting point of all their calculations. Without any further ado then, they immediately pass on to a rigidly mathematical computation of what the *Catholic* population should be. In other words, the authors incorrectly presume, in their calculations as well as in their checking processes, that *only Catholics necessarily produce the 550,000 children annually baptized in the Catholic Church.* But anyone at all familiar with American society knows that this is not so.

Being no statistician myself, I am unable to speak authoritatively about conditions in the country as a whole; but in our own diocese for the past five years mixed marriages have constituted over forty per cent of our total number of marriages. We can safely assume that a large number of these non-Catholic spouses will remain non-Catholic indefinitely, although most of them may keep their ante-nuptial promises to have their children baptized and reared Catholic. From this it follows that *our annual infant baptisms do not all come from a purely Catholic population.* The immediate observation is that one should not immediately ridicule an apparently high birth rate derived by simply prorating the "Catholic" births among the Catholics of a given territory, since the joke may be rather on the one making the computation for not counting in the non-Catholic contributors to the "Catholic"-birth aggregate.

In the first place, there are the non-Catholic spouses themselves who directly are half responsible for many births recorded as Catholic. These spouses are not counted as Catholics in parish censuses; neither are they to be regarded as Catholics in any estimate of our Catholic population. How many such persons there are in the United States may be entirely unknown at the present time, but their number could be ascertained if all pastors would report the number of "mixed" families in their parishes. Whatever it may be, at this point of the discussion their unknown aggregate can be designated by the convenient letter X.

In the second place, there is a concomitant number of unmarried persons (children, spinsters, bachelors, widows, widowers, etc.) who indirectly, or statistically, contribute to the collective total of births in any given territory; for whenever and wherever a birth rate is reckoned, these non-progenitors constitute a considerable portion of the population from which the rate is derived. The 1940 census revealed that there were 60,278,222 married persons and 71,391,053 unmarried persons in the United States at the time. In other words, there was a ratio of 1.18 unmarried persons to every married person in the nation in 1940. For this reason it becomes necessary to add to each non-Catholic spouse directly contributing to "Catholic" births a concomitant of 1.18 non-Catholic indirect contributors, since the concomitant can neither be validly counted with "non-Catholic"-birth producers nor be pilfered from Catholic ranks nor, finally, be completely disregarded. Hence, the total number of non-Catholics who directly and indirectly produce "Catholic" births, and who therefore contribute to the Catholic birth rate, can be expressed by 2.18X. Consequently also the authors' estimate of 33,000,000 (as well as their 30,000,000, lowered for other reasons) would have to be discounted by something like 2.18X in order to represent the true, birth-rate-derived Catholic population of this country.

To illustrate my point on a parochial scale I can supply statistics from our Chancery files for the unknown X of the foregoing two paragraphs. After taking a fairly complete census, one parish reported in 1941 a Catholic population of 2599 and infant baptisms in the number of 44. A superficial computation would give the parish a birth rate of 17. But the parish also reported 270 non-Catholic spouses in "mixed" families, who with their unmarried concomitants increase to 588. Thus, by adding the known 588 contributors to "Catholic" births into the population, we get the correct birth rate of 13.8. Conversely, had only the number of births and the birth rate of 13.8 been known, a superficial computation would have given that parish a population of 3188, or 589 (22.6%) more than was actually reported.

Another parish, after a thorough census, reported in 1943 a Catholic population of 1116 and 30 infant baptisms. Rigid computation would give the parish a birth rate of 26.8. But this parish likewise reported 77 non-Catholic husbands and wives, representing a total of 168 non-Catholic producers of "Catholic" births. By adding these to the total, we get a corrected birth rate of 23.3. Conversely again, had only the birth rate of 23.3 and the number of births been known, a superficial computation would have resulted in an estimate of 1287 for the Catholic population of the parish, or 171 (15.3%) above the actual.

Again, in 1942 four of our larger parishes taken at random reported a total Catholic population of 7507, and a total of 779 non-Catholic spouses in "mixed" families. That makes the "Catholic"-birth producing population in those four parishes equal to 9205, or 22.5% higher than their actual Catholic population. As far as we know, this may be close to the average for the country as a whole. At any rate, some such percentage should be considered whenever the number of Catholic births is correlated with general birth rates for the purpose of computing our real Catholic population.

It may be concluded from the observations I make here that, whatever value one may attribute to the authors' estimate of 33,000,000 for the Catholic population of the United States, by leaving out of consideration the patently numerous non-Catholic contributors to our Catholic birth rate their estimate, on the sole evidence of the parishes cited above, can be anywhere from 15.3% to 22.6% (roughly 20%) in obvious error. On the other hand, it is possible that the factor which I am stressing here is not so prominent as I make it out to be. If so, I would be delighted to have the authors of "What is Our Real Catholic Population?" expose my errors and restore their original figures to good grace, so that we could find mutual satisfaction in knowing how really numerous we are.

Duluth, Minn. GEORGE A. GALLIK

It has been called to our attention that the article "What is Our Real Catholic Population?" published in the May 1944 issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* understated the Catholic population for the Diocese of Paterson. [Ed.]

WHY A CATHOLIC FORUM?

Interest in public forums is one of the most natural and healthy evidences of democracy in America. This springs naturally from the purposes of the forum: instruction in matters of common concern, uplift, stimulation of thought and interest in matters of significance, and community participation in planning for the future. From the beginning of free expression in America, the town hall has been an institution symbolic of the determination of Americans to join hands in bettering the life of their communities. The lyceum also, with definite cultural objectives, followed the movement of the immigrant westward and found a hearty welcome, not only in the larger cities, but also in thousands of smaller centers, wherever people brought with them an eagerness to improve themselves and to create a richer, fuller life for their children. In those places where suitable auditoriums were not available, the chautauqua pitched its tents and brought to millions of people the best talent that the American platform had to offer. In any appraisal of the cultural life of America and of the alertness of Americans to the higher values of life, the forum in its various manifestations, together with its logical partner, the public library, must take a place of honor and pride.

That the forum has not been displaced today, even by the school, as an agency of public education is perfectly obvious. There is hardly an urban center of any consequence which does not feature at least one series of public lectures. Schools find it highly desirable to supplement their regular courses with occasional conferences and addresses for their student bodies by outside speakers of prominence and to sponsor programs of an intellectual character for the general public. If the radio may be considered as an extension of the forum idea, in many of its finer features, it may well be argued that the forum takes its place of importance side by side with the newspaper and the national magazine as an educational agency for the people at large.

Possibly, this is to stretch the meaning of the term beyond its proper limits. Some persons maintain that a true conception of a forum should indicate specifically the participation of the audience or assembly in the discussion, so that anyone may rise to air his views and to supplement or dispute those set forth by the speaker. There may be some merit to this contention, and as a matter of fact many forums make provision for just such articulation. Others have found by experience that the system of allowing the audience to question the speaker, rather than by delivering him and the rest of the house to the mercies of spontaneous orators, serves the same purpose to better satisfaction. But in all cases, the essence of the forum is realized if the speaker is left free to present his own views and the members of the audience are allowed to form their own judgments.

By this token, the forum provides a platform and an audience far freer than either the classroom or the pulpit. It is presumed that the forum speaker comes prepared, not merely to give an academic recital of facts, but to lend the weight of a superior intellect to their correlation and interpretation. And because he is free to indulge in a wide range of subjects and advance far beyond the field of fundamental principles and related exhortation, he may with perfect propriety discuss highly debatable matters and even leave his audience in a state of mental agitation or confusion, which would be unpardonable in a preacher.

It is possibly this freedom of expression, wide range of subject matter in controverted topics, and lack of finality in their solution that has made the idea of a Catholic forum so unpalatable to many persons. Nevertheless, these very qualities give vitality to the forum and make it a highly desirable supplement to both the classroom and pulpit. In a word, direction is given to thinking, and public opinion is formed, not merely by the presentation of incontrovertable facts or repetition of the difference between right and wrong, but also by the courageous examination of issues of the day and by the sifting process that comes from the clash of intellects.

When Catholics learn to take a keen interest in the living world about them, to broaden the horizons of their knowledge of secular events, to distinguish between principle and the endeavor to apply it, sometimes by the method of trial and error, they have become a vital influence in their community. When they have learned to suspend their judgment for further investigation or to differ with a speaker without wishing to report him to the ecclesiastical authorities or chastise the organization that sponsored his appearance, real progress has been made. They may even find that such challenge to their intellectual security is the first step to a real comprehension of Catholic principles and to the painful but wholesome realization that the principles of religion, and their responsibilities, extend into regions far beyond the little pew at Sunday Mass.

The Catholic forum, therefore, far from being either a rival to the pulpit, a hidden threat to orthodoxy, or an innocuous fad of amateur intellectuals, provides a most natural and effective medium for the public expression of Christian principles, the formation of a Christian mind on important issues of the day, and a corresponding influence on public opinion and human events. Protestant, Jewish, and purely secular groups have long since realized the great potentialities of the public platform. It is time that Catholics became aware of this and availed themselves of the opportunity to make a distinct contribution along the same lines. In a number of communities this action has already been taken and with considerable success; but much remains to be done to extend the idea and render it more effective. A Catholic community without a Catholic forum, as someone has said, is like an auditorium without an amplifying system.

A number of difficulties may be alleged against getting a Catholic forum under way and maintaining its existence over a period of time. One of the primary difficulties is said to be that of securing representative Catholic speakers. One Catholic forum which achieved considerable success decided to end its existence at the end of four years because it had exhausted, or believed it had exhausted, the supply of available talent. "Practically every well-known Catholic speaker in the economic, social, religious, and literary field," its obituary announced, "has appeared before the members of the Club; it would be necessary to have a number of them come back again if the lectures were to continue."

Taken at its face value, such a statement might come as something of a shock to the Catholics of the nation who have expended a rather substantial sum on the Catholic school system and have been led to believe that Catholic education, Catholic philosophy, and the age-old tradition of Catholic culture should produce a rich dividend in Catholic leaders and spokesmen with a message. As a matter of fact, the author of this article has been conducting Catholic forums for a period now entering its fourteenth year, and, while a number of "repeat" lecturers have been engaged by popular demand, there has been no dearth of splendid Catholic talent. True, a goodly number of these speakers were unknown to the body of the Catholic public; but part of the business of a forum is to acquaint the public with Catholic men and women who have distinguished themselves in the field of thought and literature, and part of its business also is to give such leaders an opportunity to present their thought to the public.

Prestige is something that must be developed. If Catholics are not alert to recognize merit among their own and to honor it, they can hardly complain if the world at large fails to perform the same task for them. A questionnaire at the end of the season of a Catholic forum will usually reveal that for the next season the audience would like to hear a number of the same Catholic speakers again; the others on the suggested list will be names of non-Catholic authors and other celebrities who may have precious little to offer from a Catholic standpoint. Thereupon, it becomes the cheerful task of the forum director or committee to scan the Catholic world and produce another program with at least a nucleus of outstanding Catholic speakers. The results are generally a revelation to Catholics and a source of admiration to the general public. Surely, this is good Catholic action.

This does not mean that the Catholic forum should depend exclusively upon Catholic speakers. On the contrary, the occasional introduction of non-Catholic authorities in various fields of interest may well have a stimulating, broadening, and genuinely edifying effect upon a Catholic audience, providing the speaker can be depended upon not to offend Catholic principles. Men of distinguished achievement can generally be so depended upon; and a little investigation into their backgrounds and philosophy of life will determine this point. The seriousness, competence, and intellectual honesty with which a problem can be handled and facts gathered and analyzed by those not of the household of the faith often serves to shake the smugness of such Catholic representatives as think that all problems can be solved by the application of a syllogism, without further investigation on their part.

Another difficulty advanced against the organization of a Catholic forum is lack of interest on the part of Catholics. Even if one were to grant the validity of this argument, it would only argue the necessity of a forum to stir their interest to contemporary issues as Catholics. As a matter of fact, however, there is plenty of interest. Nearly every community of any size has a considerable number of Catholics of college or high school education, or of less academic privilege but largely self-taught and eager to learn, for whose cultural development little or no provision is made by the Church. The Sunday sermon is generally limited to basic doctrinal or moral considerations; practically no guidance is given them in Catholic reading. If they wish to participate in the advantages of a forum, they must join the local civic or sectarian, frequently Jewish, lecture series. Many of these people are amenable to the suggestion that there is such a thing as advanced and competent Catholic thought on contemporary issues. If a Catholic forum is provided, they will patronize its program.

It is true that the majority of forum audiences are women; but this does not indicate that the appeal or value of the forum is distinctively feminine. Nor, for that matter, does it indicate that the forum, therefore, exercises a restricted influence. It is a fact that the women of the United States, besides being its principal spenders, are the principal patrons of literature and general cultural enterprises. The influence of American women through public and private school systems as the teachers and guides of youth is tremendous. It is superfluous to mention the cultural influence of women in the home; and as a civic power, through local, state, and national organizations, the women of the land constitute in many respects a genuine matriarchy. No apologies are needed for justifying an audience of this character.

The interest of the male element, however, can be aroused by determinination and persistence. In the present stages of our cultural development, the average American man ranges his interest between the material affairs of his business, the maintenance of his family group, contact with larger issues through the newspaper, and recreation of a social character or interests in athletics. It becomes a function of the forum to reach out into this vast field and convince the average Catholic man that the principles which he implicitly accepts and the issues upon which Christianity must take a stand call for his earnest consideration.

He must be brought to realize that there are powerful and active forces which would undermine and destroy his Catholic faith and that of his children and that a passive attitude on his part is dangerous to his most precious possessions. He must be encouraged to overcome his fear of being considered a "high brow," a "religious fanatic," or of compromising his masculinity if he takes a serious and systematic interest in things of the mind, in issues of national and international scope, and in the deeper implications of religion. He must be taught to run the risk of being bored occasionally, realizing that the development of intelligence is a gradual process, that a solid contribution to society requires a sound knowledge, not merely a "yes" or "no" answer or a hasty taking up of cudgels. Only in this way can genuine Catholic leadership be developed, which the world will respect and follow. The experience of the Church in the defection of its men in the Latin or so-called "Catholic countries" is too vivid to be ignored.

Another problem which gives concern to the Catholic forum is the interest and attendance of youth. It has been the experience of this writer, as well as the observation of many others, that the bulk of the audiences of Catholic forums are in the late thirties and over. Frequent question is raised respecting the conspicuous absence of the numerous young men and women who have graduated from Catholic high schools and colleges and who might be presumed to have developed a constructive interest in matters of intelligent Catholic concern.

A number of practical reasons have been advanced as accounting for this situation, such as the financial problems, marital preoccupations, and the like, of young men and women trying to secure an independent foothold on life. There is a bare possibility also that the matter covered by the forum program is already more than familiar to them and that they have already become exhausted, so to speak, by "every well-known Catholic speaker in the economic, social, religious, and literary field." If such is the case, it would appear that we have reached the stage of cultural dry-rot.

Is it not possible that, to find the basic answer to this situation, we might have to delve into the attitudes which are developed or are allowed to develop within the Catholic school system itself? It is dangerous to generalize; but, in too many cases, boys and girls are emerging from Catholic schools with a pronounced allergy against Catholic reading or anything that smacks of Catholic culture. Whether this reaction is the result of over-zealous forcing of "required" Catholic reading, without the cultivation of an intelligent interest, or whether, on the contrary, it results from a failure within our schools to call attention to contemporary Catholic contributions in the field of literature and general culture is difficult to say. This calls for investigation, which is beyond the scope of this article. But the fact remains that young Catholics, who should be the support and the vitalizing force of Catholic cultural projects, appear to be emerging from our schools with weird ideas which make too many of them a total loss, at least for a period of years, to the cause which they have been educated to serve.

If one may be permitted to make suggestions, here is a branch of the apostolate in which the parish priest can make a magnificent contribution. Through young people's clubs and later through women's sodalities and through Holy Name societies and other organizations of men, the priest can implant or develop a sense of values which leads upwards and onwards from merely social or recreational outlooks and which shows that cultural growth, the full development of the human personality, must be identified with spiritual growth. It is extremely difficult to develop cultural interests and cultural leadership among the Catholic laity, unless the priests lead the way. If priests themselves betray a lack of interest by their failure to attend and support the Catholic forum, or suggest that such projects are merely an evidence of slight lunacy (as is sometimes reported), it is only natural that Catholics who are ambitious for the cultural prestige of their Church and for their own development should become bewildered and that Catholics who are in need of guidance and encouragement along these lines should remain cold to the whole idea.

Among other difficulties of a practical nature which may be suggested is that of financing that Catholic forum. This problem assumes different proportions in different communities. Adjustment of the organization to local resources and action in accordance with certain tested principles will usually meet the challenge. The first principle is that it is a mistake to regard a forum as a money-raising scheme. If a forum cannot stand on its cultural and spiritual purposes, it is bound to fail. The second principle is that a successful forum must pay its way. A free forum that expects speakers to donate their services indefinitely cannot expect to have a long life; and one that refuses to pay adequate compensation to its talent will never rise above mediocrity.

The reasons for these principles are clear. The success of a forum over a period of time depends upon the excellence of its speakers. Platform speakers who can command the interest of the public and present their matter authoritatively may be presumed to have spent many years and much money in preparation of their subject. It is only reasonable that they should be properly paid. Such payment will naturally depend upon the prestige of the speaker and his expenses en route; and the actual number of minutes occupied by the lecture or address is no gauge of what that honorarium should be. Many well-known speakers are glad to co-operate with struggling forums by reducing their customary fee and, upon occasion, are willing to donate their services. To expect them to continue this practice indefinitely, however, is an unpardonable imposition; and the forum which tries to beg its way is simply ignoring the inevitable laws of elementary economics and human psychology. And, as the ancient saying has it, the most expensive service is that which is given free.

The only way to face this problem is to study the resources of the community, count heads, and build a budget. A simple process of division will indicate how much can be appropriated for speakers. The next step is to endeavor to secure speakers within this price range. Some communities, particularly the large metropolitan centers, will be able to command what are known as "top-flight" names as a special attraction. With judicious planning, smaller communities can do the same; but in any event satisfactory programs can be built up, since "names" and real ability are not always synonymous. A helpful suggestion for the Catholic forum is to make contact with other Catholic forums already in existence and to plan programs, so far as possible, in common. This may mean that a speaker can plan a schedule, so as to reduce his expenses en route; and a program of several lectures offered in conjunction may well make it possible to secure the best talent for a reasonably reduced combination cost.

Sound financing of a forum means a budget system with income expectancy based upon a campaign for the sale of season tickets.

A free forum will not do, for obvious reasons; and dependance upon the revenue from single admissions involves too many risks. The forum program should be presented and sold, so far as possible, as a program, and the audience should be made to feel that they are genuine participants as members and supporters of the project.

The writer of this article has found it feasible to divide membership into three classes. A general or active membership provides season tickets at the minimum cost. A sustaining or patron membership, which is honored through recognition by name on the annual bulletin or report, is set at a higher amount to include a donation to strengthen the financial position of the forum. A guarantee membership is solicited of a few persons who can, in addition to their sustaining membership, pledge an additional amount, say twenty-five, fifty, or even one hundred dollars, to be assessed on a pro-rata basis in the event of an annual deficit. The guarantors should be entitled to a financial statement; but it should be understood that they are not to determine the subjects or speakers on the program.

So far as enlisting membership in the forum is concerned, the same means are available as for any event of public or parochial character. Announcements from the pulpit of an explanatory and encouraging nature, publicity through the newspapers, and a campaign for memberships through the mails and through individual solicitation will produce the desired results. This means, of course, persistent action and a progressive outlook. No enterprise carries itself. It may be found that, for various reasons, approximately one-third of the membership will not renew for the following year; as a result, a fresh campaign must be inaugurated each season, in addition to the special notices for each lecture. National advertisers give the clue: they never let the public forget their product, and their constant aim is to enlarge their clientele.

One of the most discouraging experiences, at least on the surface, is the development of a successful forum, only to find the sudden emergence of other groups which might co-operate in the formation of one large forum but prefer to compete in the organization of several small groups. Part of the significance and public influence of a forum undoubtedly lies in the importance and size of the audience. The only answer to this challenge, however, is that of reasonable co-operation and encouragement. In large communities there may be room for more than one Catholic forum; where this is not the case, the weaker elements will find their natural level or serve the useful purpose at least of educating a new sector of the Catholic public to the value of a strong and representative Catholic forum.

With respect to the subject matter of the lectures, it is obvious that the forum platform is not the place for sermons or doctrinal instruction. It must be stressed, if need be, that the forum program, whether of lay or clerical speakers, is not in competition with the pulpit, the class room, or the convert class. The forum may serve as a feeder to all three; but its methods and its primary purposes are quite different. The forum, it may be repeated, serves as an instrument by which Catholic principles may be applied to current problems of the world in general and by which the interest of Catholics is aroused to issues of which they should be conscious. Partisan politics, of course, are to be avoided, as are such matters as will only arouse local bitterness. The objective, rather, is to examine matters of common concern, matters of national and international interest, in the economic, sociological, educational, literary, and religious fields and to bring out into the open the larger implications of Christian principles and the application of vigorous Catholic intelligence to the problems of the day. One of the primary purposes of the forum is the stimulation of Catholic consciousness and Catholic thought and the development of that tolerance for difference of opinion, which is essential if progress is to be made in arriving at sound conclusions.

Objection is frequently raised on the score that many forums have featured speakers from abroad, some of them with a propagandist message, others of admitted importance as literary or political personalties but failures on the platform, and still others with such little command of the English language as to be unintelligible to most of the audience. All this, although incidental to a forum program, may be true. Nevertheless, as a medium of public throught with a wide range of interests, the forum cannot ignore important speakers from abroad as they become available. In addition, there is real value in the mere fact of coming into contact with personalities of international reputation, even though one may differ with their views or have difficulty occasionally in understanding a strange accent. And if these reasons are insufficient for presenting distinguished foreigners, there still remains the implied challenge to Catholic Americans to merit a stronger place on the forum platform for themselves.

It is hardly necessary to point out the limitations of the forum. It would be foolish to represent it as taking the place of intensive study or of eliminating the need for Catholic reading. But it will be found that the well organized Catholic forum will immediately create the need for a Catholic library and will encourage the formation of Catholic study groups. It will bring together the intellectual and cultural Catholic elements of the community, deepen their appreciation of the Catholic faith, and encourage their desire of further development along Catholic lines. It will create a genuine bond between local Catholic interests and those of the great Catholic world beyond. In every way, it will serve to intensify the spirit of Catholic tradition and make the Faith a vibrant reality. There can be no doubt that a Catholic forum, intelligently organized and properly conducted, is a most important form of Catholic action and will richly repay whatever unselfish time and energy is put into it.

JAMES A. MAGNER

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

MISSION INTENTION

"Mutual Good Will between Christians and Mohammedans" is the Mission Intention for the month of January, 1945.

THE CHURCH AND THE STATE OF SIEGE

Some of the judgments which have been advanced about the Council of Trent and its effects upon the life of the Catholic Church have a predominantly academic interest. One theory, however, has extremely practical implications. It is the famous theory of the state of siege, which owes its influence, if not its origin, to the English Catholic publicist and lecturer, Mr. Wilfrid Ward.[1] A great deal of modern writing, not only of the popular, but also of the more pretentious variety, explicitly adopts, or is influenced by, the doctrine of the state of siege. As a result, a good portion of our Catholic population is being indoctrinated with this theory. Thus it is clearly the business of the American priest to consider and to evaluate Mr. Ward's teaching on this point.

According to those who propose the state of siege theory, the habitual attitude of the Catholic Church towards teachings in the world around her was one of prudent assimilation and intellectual adaptibility. Because of the radical nature of Luther's attack, the Church abandoned this procedure at the Council of Trent and adopted the mentality and the characteristic activity of a state of siege. This state of siege consisted in an abnormal attitude of defence. It was supposed to have ended with the Catholic revival of the early nineteenth century, although the residual defensive mentality was represented as still existing. Progress in Catholic life and letters should involve the final abandonment of this mentality.

The key point in Mr. Ward's theory is the assumption that, at the Council of Trent, the Catholic Church inaugurated a policy quite at variance with her usual manner of dealing with outside teaching. To show what they mean, the proponents of this doctrine have recourse to a development of their highly colorful analogy. Mr. Ward,[2] the Abbot Vonier,[3] and Dr. Jalland[4] describe, each in his own way, the dislocation of life involved in a city beset by an enemy. During the course of the conflict works which are in themselves valuable are reliquished in favor of tasks which, while themselves of lesser moment, are requisite for the effective defence of the city. The orderly processes of justice are set aside in favor of the more summarily effective court-martial. Doubts and declarations which would be perfectly proper in normal times are now considered as treasonable.

---

[1] Mr. Ward expounded this teaching in his essay "The Rigidity of Rome," published in his *Problems and Persons* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1903), pp. 66 ff. His daughter, Maisie Ward (Mrs. Francis Sheed), is quite correct in observing in her book *Insurrection versus Resurrection* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1937, p. 2), that the phrase "a state of siege" is now "almost a commonplace" in treating of the post-Tridentine period.

Applying this analogy to the post-Tridentine period of Catholic history, Mr. Wilfrid Ward found that the Church ceased to assimilate and to adapt herself to the doctrines and the interests of non-Catholic intellectuals after the Council of Trent. Her theology became predominantly polemic and negative. Dogma and philosophical subjects were no longer matters for debate. Theologians tended to achieve a rigid uniformity. Points of difference with Protestantism were emphasized; matters on which there was agreement were neglected. Catholic truths were enclosed in formulae, and these formulae resolutely defended, even though they were capable of other than an orthodox interpretation, while the corresponding Protestant formulae were attacked, despite the fact that they were sometimes patient of a perfectly acceptable explanation. All of these effects were under the direction of the Jesuits "those wonderful Janissaries of the Papal army,"[5] as Mr. Ward called them.

The men who expounded or used the theory of the state of siege wished to prove that the Church should no longer conserve those elements in her government, her teaching, or her devotion, which are characteristically post-Tridentine, and thus inferentially the results of the state of siege rather than of the normal genius of Christianity. Mr. Ward wanted Catholics to abandon their "exclusive" attitude towards teachings emanating from non-Catholic sources. The Abbot Vonier looks for a return to "classical" Christianity which was supposed to have been largely submerged during the period of conflict. Mr. Edward Watkin, ingeniously combining Mr. Ward's doctrine with a metaphor employed by Von Hügel, claims that the counter-Reformation in some way missed the Catholic "centre."[6] Most recently the distinguished Anglican clergyman, Dr. Trevor Gervase Jalland, has employed Mr. Ward's analogy to teach that the Roman Pontiff assumed abnormal dictatorial powers during the time of siege.[7] Naturally Mr. Ward, a sincere and enlightened Catholic, made no such assertion.

---

[2] Cf. *op. cit.* p. 76 ff.

[3] Cf. *The New and Eternal Covenant* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1930), p. 3.

[4] Cf. *The Church and the Papacy* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1944), pp. 454 ff.

[5] *Op. cit.*, p. 78.

Before we can begin to evaluate the theory of the state of siege, we must make one pertinent observation. It is perfectly obvious that the external manifestations of devotion and the literary style of theological writing change somewhat sharply from age to age. The Catholics today will show their attachment to the Church of Jesus Christ in a manner a bit different from that of the men of one hundred years ago. Any man who is at all familiar with the literature of scholastic theology would be able to tell, within the range of a few years, the date of the opus he is examining.

Thus there really is a characteristic style and mentality of the post-Tridentine theologians. Although they differ from one another sharply in many conclusions, Vasquez, Sylvius, and John of St. Thomas have in common a style and interests which set them apart from their pre-Tridentine co-laborers, Driedo, Latomus, and Richard Smith. The literary products of these theologians of the golden age are also recognizably different from the eighteenth century works of Tournely and Billuart, and the nineteenth century books of Murray and Kenrick. Thus, the fact that there is such a thing as a distinct post-Tridentine literary mentality in no way constitutes evidence in favor of the theory of the state of siege.

---

[6] Cf. *The Catholic Centre* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1943), p. 63. In a letter to Maisie Ward, published in her *The Wilfrid Wards and the Transition* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1934, p. 301), the old Baron announced that he belonged to the "centre" rather than to one of the two extreme wings, "the *Ultras* and the *Extras* as they have been wittily called." Von Hügel thought of the "centre" as a position occupied by himself, the majority of Catholics, and several prominent intellectuals, among them Saint Francis of Sales and Fenelon. Watkin, on the other hand, considers Catholicism itself as the "centre" with reference to other religious systems, and thinks of the "Catholic centre" as the integral and accurate presentation of Catholicism. In neither case is the metaphor very valuable.

[7] Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 454.

If this theory is correct, there was not merely a development in the science of theology with a corresponding modification of style and arrangement in literary production, but there was a real and ascertainable change in the policy of the Church and in the intentions of the writers. Mr. Ward has presented his evidence in favor of that conclusion. It is interesting to examine it at some length.

> The future priests were withdrawn by the Council of Trent from the universities, and each Bishop was exhorted to establish a seminary for their training as disciplined soldiers of the Church. The Jesuits—those wonderful Janissaries of the Papal Army who arose to defend the ancient order—represented in their military character, and in their very name—"the Company of Jesus"—the genius of the crisis. They surveyed the theological field as well as the field of practical discipline and personal piety. Dogma and philosophy were thus largely removed from the free discussions of the universities, and consecrated to the controversial requirements of the ecclesiastical institutes which were fashioning soldiers of debate and martyrs for the faith. The gradual analysis and further explication of theological truth, due to the sifting by the schools of the traditionary theology, in the light of the thought of the time, gave place to that defence of existing positions which is exacted by the needs of polemic.[8]

Mr. Ward was quite mistaken in thinking that the Council of Trent withdrew candidates for the priesthood from the universities. As a matter of fact it explicitly extended the ***privilegium fori*** to clerical candidates for major orders "in an ecclesiastical seminary or with the permission of the bishop in some school or university."[9] Mr. Ward speaks as if the Council intended the seminaries only as training grounds for spiritual soldiers. His teaching is an inadequate and inaccurate explanation of the actual wording of Trent, which declares that "all cathedral and metropolitan churches and churches greater than these shall be bound, each according to its means and the extent of its diocese, to provide for, to educate in religion, and to train in ecclesiastical discipline, a certain number of boys of their city or diocese . . ."[10] It was misleading at best to infer that the Council looked to training in devotion at the expense of intellectual instruction.

---

[8] *Op. cit.*, p. 78.

[9] Sess. XXIII, cap. 6. I have used the translation of Father H. J. Schroeder, O.P., in his *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1941), p. 168.

Furthermore, Mr. Ward's confidence in the "military character" is not shared by Father Joseph H. Fichter, himself a Janissary of no mean historical acumen. According to Father Fichter, "the belief that the companions thought of themselves as spiritual soldiers and wished to form their group after the model of a military company or battalion has no foundation."[11] The "survey" made by the Jesuits turns out, upon examination, to be their activity in teaching and in writing upon every department of the sacred sciences. They certainly made such a survey, but so, for that matter did a great many other Catholic groups, universities and religious communities among them.

It would be extremely interesting to know what persuaded Mr. Ward that "dogma and philosophy were thus largely removed from the free discussions of the universities." The period during which all of this is supposed to have taken place is the one which saw the inauguration of the Thomist-Molinist controversy, by far the most spirited debate in the history of the Catholic schools. It is perfectly true, of course, that neither the theologians of the post-Tridentine period nor any other real theologians have ventured to question the dogma of the Catholic Church itself. But it is also certain that discussion on dogmatic and philosophical topics was never freer or more acrimonious than during the days subsequent to the Council of Trent. Mr. Ward's contention that the post-Tridentine period saw "a rigid uniformity among theologians at variance with the freer atmosphere of the palmy days of Scholasticism"[12] brings us inevitably to the lamentable conclusion that his exuberance as a lecturer must have outweighed his competence in the field of theological literature. Surely such doughty warriors as Gregory of Valentia and Thomas de Lemos, the chief disputants at the *Congregationes de Auxiliis*, and the dozens of first-class theologians who joined them in the fray, would have been somewhat surprised to learn that their writings exhibited "a rigid uniformity."

---

[10] Sess. XXIII, cap. 18. (Schroeder, p. 175).

[11] *James Laynez, Jesuit* (St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1944), p. 29 n.

[12] *Op. cit.*, p. 81.

The actual theory of the state of siege rests on the assumption that the Catholic writers of the post-Tridentine period adopted a defensive attitude quite at variance with the mentality of their mediaeval predecessors. It supposes that the teachers of the Middle Ages were content to expound Catholic doctrine without any particular concern for heresy, while men like Suarez and Sylvius were primarily anxious to crush opposing doctrine. The men of earlier times are pictured as considering the world about them as either friendly or neutral, while the poor laborers during the state of siege were convinced that only hostility to their teaching could be found outside of the Catholic schools.

Such a view finds little support in the literature of mediaeval theology itself. The great teacher of the middle ages was Peter the Lombard, and his *Four Books of Sentences* constituted the great text of the Catholic schools. If we are to find the classical mediaeval ideal anywhere, it should be in this work. Yet Peter wrote, he tells us, "to defend our faith against the errors of carnal and bestial men with the shields of the tower of David, or rather show that it is so defended."[13] As far as the enemies of the faith are concerned, he intended "to overthrow their church which is hateful to God and to close their mouths, lest they should be able to pour the poison of wickedness into others."[14]

Answering the heretical contention that the true Church of Jesus Christ is everywhere resisted, while the Roman Church is called Holy and Catholic by all men, Moneta of Cremona declared that the Roman Church, "as a matter of fact is everywhere contradicted." He asks the question: "Is it not opposed by the Jews and by the pagans and by the false brethren, of whom you [his Waldensian opponent] are one?" Then comes the statement which would startle one who takes the theory of the state of siege very seriously. "Those who call it [the Roman Church] are very few (*valde pauci sunt*) in comparison with those who assert the contrary. All these latter call it a heresy, but they teach falsely."[15]

Even the great St. Thomas Aquinas himself failed lamentably to measure up to the standards set for mediaeval authors by proponents of the state of siege theory. The Angelic Doctor was by no means unconcerned with heresy when he penned his *Summa Contra Gentiles*. He wrote, he informs us "to manifest the truth which the Catholic faith professes, to the best of our ability, by eliminating contrary errors."[16]

---

[13] *Prologus in Librum Primum Sententiarum.* The translation is our own.

[14] *Loc. cit.*

[15] *Adversus Catharos et Valdenses Libri Quinque* (Rome, 1743), lib. V, cap. 1, p. 395.

The state of siege theory denies any real progress in the field of dogmatic theology during the post-Tridentine period. Yet, at the very time when the state of siege was supposed to have been most repressive, the Catholic schools were enriched by the writing and the teaching of St. Robert Bellarmine, Suarez, John of St. Thomas, and the Salmanticenses. Even a casual acquaintance with the literature of scholastic theology or a comparison of the writings of Billot and Garrigou-Lagrange with those of the great pre-Tridentine theologians like Turrecremata and Driedo would serve to show the magnitude of the progress which has been accomplished during this supposedly barren period.

There are certain other questions which we must ask, and answer, in order to evaluate the state of siege theory accurately. In the first place, did post-Tridentine Catholic theology stress points of difference with Protestantism and pass over points on which Catholics and Protestants agreed? The state of siege theory holds that it acted in this way, but the evidence of theological literature points in quite another direction. The procedure of St. Robert Bellarmine in proposing his own definition of the Church may be taken as typical of the Catholic procedure. St. Robert first set forth and explained five different heretical definitions of the true Church of Jesus Christ, including those offered by the leaders of Protestantism. On comparing them, he found that they had one element in common. All of them agreed that the possession of some interior virtue was requisite for membership in that society with which our Lord had promised that He would abide until the end of time. St. Robert then went on to show that the inward perfections of faith, hope, and charity really belonged to the Church of the promises, but that they were not requisite for membership.[17] In this way he followed the method of St. Thomas, the classical procedure whereby Catholic truth is manifested by eliminating contrary errors. He did not withdraw into a shell, and simply insist upon a Catholic formula. He showed what there was of truth in the opposing position, and then put this truth in its proper place in the body of divine revelation.

---

[16] Lib. I, cap. 2.

[17] Cf. *De Ecclesia Militante*, cap. 2.

The second, and the most important question is this: Did the Catholic Church cease to exercise her assimilative functions after the Council of Trent? The answer to this, of course, depends upon the response to a more basic query: Did the Catholic Church ever possess the sort of normal assimilative function presupposed in the theory of the state of siege? As the principal proponent of this theory, Mr. Ward based his contention mainly on a passage from Newman, written before his conversion to the Church. The passage in question is found in the essay "Milman's View of Christianity," later appended by Newman himself to the eighth chapter of his *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine.*

> The doctrine of the Divine Word is Platonic; the doctrine of the Incarnation is Indian; of a divine kingdom is Judaic; of Angels and demons is Magian. . . . And wherever she [the Church] went, in trouble or in triumph, still she was a living spirit, the mind and voice of the Most High: "sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them and asking them questions"; claiming to herself what they said rightly, correcting their errors, supplying their defects, completing their beginnings, expanding their surmises, and thus gradually by means of them enlarging the range and refining the sense of her own teaching. So far then from her creed being of doubtful credit because it resembles foreign theologies, we even hold that one special way in which Providence has imparted divine knowledge to us has been by enabling her to draw and collect it together out of the world, and, in this sense, as in others, to "suck the milk of the Gentiles and to suck the breast of kings."[18]

Manifestly this passage cannot be taken as one of the most felicitous examples of Newman's literary work. The best extant criticism of the Cardinal's religious thought, Dr. Edmond Darvil Benard's *A Preface to Newman's Theology*, offers the penetrating and charitable explanation that "we must recognize the 'assimilation' passages for what they were meant to be, an *argumentum ad hominem* against those who held that the Church had formulated her body of doctrine merely by selecting various beliefs from the pagan religion."[19] But, whatever the passage from "Milman's View of Christianity" may be, it is certainly not an accurate description of any doctrinal process, normal to the Catholic Church and suspended during the post-Tridentine period.

---

[18] *Essays Critical and Historical* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1888), II, 231 f. Ward cites it (*op. cit.*, pp. 70 f.) as from *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine.*

Actually the Church of God has only one teaching mission. Hers are the responsibility and the privilege of expounding the doctrinal message which our Lord presented to the apostles, and which the apostles preached. This divine and apostolic tradition is, and always has been, the message which the Church has presented in her dogma. It is the body of teaching which Catholic theology has ever set out to explain and to defend. In the infallible presentation of that message, the Church has availed herself freely of terms and didactic methods which had previously been employed in the service of other doctrines. In the systematic and reasoned teaching of that same message, the corps of Catholic theologians have always exploited, and will always exploit, whatever effective resources that have been available in the fields of philosophy and history. That was the procedure before the Council of Trent, and the nineteenth ecumenical council did not alter or suspend it in any way.

There is nothing to prevent a man from calling this process "assimilation" or "adaptation" if he wishes to do so, although the analogies involved in these words are somewhat ineffective. But, by whatever name we choose to designate the process, it is definitely not characteristic of any one age of the Church, and it is definitely not lacking in any other. In every age there have been theologians who have used the tools of their science well. Likewise, in every age there have been men whose theological efforts have been unsuccessful because they "assimilated" ineptly. St. Thomas Aquinas, in the thirteenth century, was able to employ a great deal of the terminology and the teaching of Aristotle in such a way as to bring out accurately and unequivocally "the things which pertain to the Christian religion."[20] At the same time he was compelled to protest forcefully against the uncritical works of those who taught parts of the Aristotelian *corpus* incompatible with dogma. In post-Tridentine times many a writer diminished or ruined the value of his theological works by placing too much confidence in the dicta of Descartes, Kant, or Rosmini.

---

[19] *A Preface to Newman's Theology* (St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1945), p. 103.

[20] *Sum. Theol., Prologus.*

We must conclude, then, that the theory of the state of siege is basically inaccurate as an explanation of the effect produced within the Catholic Church by the Council of Trent. The Church, the City of God, has always been, and, until the end of time will be, beset by enemies. Individual men outside her communion may very well be favorable to her. The same may be true of various groups of non-Catholics. But she has always been perfectly correct in judging the mass of mankind outside the fold as hostile to her and to her interests. The world, as well as the flesh and the devil, must be accounted as inimical to the kingdom of God. The world, taken in this sense, is the reality which St. Augustine designated as the *Civitas terrena*, in constant opposition to the *Civitas Dei*. It is what the great pre-Tridentine theologian, John Driedo, called the *ecclesia sathanae*, continually fighting against the *ecclesia Dei*. Judged from this point of view, the siege to which the Church is subject and to which her teaching bears witness began, not at Trent, but at Jerusalem.

Thus it is incorrect to state that the position of the Church since the Council of Trent has been abnormal. It is not true that the doctrine of the Church has in any way been deflected from the center of truth during the post-Tridentine period. The power actually wielded by the Roman Pontiff is not an extraordinary authority, assumed in a time of crisis and destined to be put aside with the coming of peace, but actually the authority which pertains to him by virtue of his office as Vicar of Christ.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON
The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

MILITIA CHRISTI

It really is surprising how fellows will come to the defense of the faith once it is attacked or even questioned. Here we are in a community which is far from Catholic, and you would be amazed at all the support we received in a debate about the Church. I certainly pray that God will always give us the grace and the light to defend His Church to the best of our ability, wherever and whenever the occasion arises.

— From a letter sent by a young soldier to his brother.

Answers to Questions

SCHOOL-CHILDREN AND CONFESSION

Question: Our pastor insists that all the school-children shall go to confession on the occasion of the Ember Days, even those who have not as yet made their First Holy Communion. Has he a right to insist on this?

Answer: There seem to be two questions to be considered here. The first is whether there is an obligation upon the faithful to confess on the occasion of the Ember Days; the second, whether children are obliged to confess before they have been admitted to First Holy Communion.

As for the first question, since Canon 906 states that every member of the faithful of either sex after coming to the years of discretion, i.e., to the use of reason, is bound faithfully to confess all his sins at least once in the space of a year, without, however, specifying the days on which or the space of time within which, except as to the period of one year, the confession is to take place, it seems that the pastor is exceeding his powers when he insists that the school-children shall go to confession on the occasion of the Ember Days. The custom is certainly laudable and much to be encouraged, but it seems that one cannot go beyond persuasion in this matter, since there seems to be no basis in law for insistence upon an obligation.

As for the second question, it is possible that children may have been delayed in receiving First Holy Communion even though they have already attained the use of reason. In such a case, since the aforesaid Canon 906 makes no exception for those who have not as yet been admitted to First Holy Communion, it would seem that these children are bound by the general law to confess. This view is strengthened by the private response of the Commission for the Interpretation of the Code of Canon Law given Jan. 3, 1918, to the effect that children who have been admitted to First Holy Communion before reaching the age of seven are bound by Canon 906. The reasoning is that these children could not have been admitted to First Holy Communion unless they had, *de facto*, reached the use of reason, at which time the obligation to confess attaches. By analogy, then, we should say that if they have attained the use of reason even before they are admitted to First Holy Communion the obligation attaches, since it is made to depend upon the attainment of the use of reason with no mention of whether First Holy Communion has been received. We conclude, then, that the pastor is correct in urging that all children who have reached the use of reason shall confess even if they have not as yet received First Holy Communion. The admission to First Holy Communion would be merely an indication of the attainment of the use of reason.

CONDITION FOR ABSOLUTION

Question: A man who neither speaks nor acts as though he were scrupulous still claims that he does not consider himself worthy of going to Holy Communion even after considerable arguing and explaining. Can such a man be absolved in confession?

Answer: The general rule stated in Canon 886 is that if the confessor cannot doubt of the dispositions of the penitent and the latter asks for absolution, the absolution is neither to be denied nor to be put off. In the present case we have the penitent asking for absolution, so the question is whether the confessor can doubt of the dispositions of the penitent in view of the fact that he claims that he does not consider himself worthy of going to Holy Communion. It does not appear that the man is under any particular obligation to receive Holy Communion as he would be during Paschal time or when in danger of death, hence it does not appear that he has a deliberate will to violate some law by his refusal to receive Holy Communion. It further appears that he does wish to submit his sins to the tribunal of Penance in order to be absolved of them. His disposition, then, is to receive absolution, which is the disposition to be considered here and now by the confessor; while his disposition with regard to Holy Communion concerns a future act, and he may change his mind once he receives the grace of the sacrament of Penance. It is unfortunate that the man seems to be laboring under a sort of Jansenist misconception as to worthiness for the Holy Eucharist but that does not appear clearly enough to warrant us in refusing him absolution when he asks for it.

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF OBJECTIONABLE BOOKS

Question: Not infrequently the subject for discussion at a Catholic study club or forum is some recent book of an objectionable character. Should not such a custom be reprobated on the grounds that some persons are thus induced to read a bad book which otherwise they would not bother about?

Answer: It is true that the circumstances mentioned by the questioner may constitute a temptation to some Catholics to read an unsavory book which otherwise they would not notice. But, on the other hand, lectures and discussions about objectionable books that are being currently read tend to put Catholics on their guard against such books and help our people to understand just why they should not read them. If we expect to conduct an effective campaign against bad literature, we must let Catholics know precisely which of the "best-sellers" are bad and why they are bad. Hence, we can apply to this problem the principle of the double effect, tolerating as a bad effect the possibility that the discussion or forum may lead some to read a bad book, and intending the good effect, the enlightening of a considerable number of people on the ethics of proper reading. The most practical method would be for a priest or a competent lay person to summarize the contents of the book and to explain why it is objectionable. Thus, there would be no necessity for the hearers to read the book themselves, while at the same time they could understand and explain to others why it should not be read. It should be noted that in the event that the book is forbidden by the Church, either explicitly or by the general norms, the person who delivers the lecture, whether he be priest or lay person, should first procure the ecclesiastical permission to read it.

CONFESSIONS OF CHILDREN

Question: If a child confesses only trifling faults which objectively can hardly be considered sins, such as the forgetting of morning prayers, disobedience to an older sister, and it is impossible to get any certain matter by questioning, what is the proper procedure for the confessor?

Answer: Some would recommend that in the case described the child should be given a blessing and dismissed. However, whenever there is a probability that the little one was guilty of a venial sin—even though the guilt was subjective and there was no objective violation of any commandment—it would seem both permissible and advisable for the confessor to impart conditional absolution. The axiom *Sacramenta propter homines* should urge us to give children the benefit of conditional absolution whenever there is even a reasonable probability that they have provided sufficient matter for sacramental pardon.

THE MORALITY OF ROBOT BOMBING

Question: Is it permissible for our military forces, in retaliation for the robot bombing which the Germans have practised, to direct robot bombs against the German cities?

Answer: According to accepted Catholic principles, although the death of non-combatants or innocent persons may be tolerated as an indirect effect of the bombing of important military objectives (Cf. *American Ecclesiastical Review,* CX, 2 (Feb. 1944), 146), a direct attack on such persons is always wrong, however great the advantages may be from the military standpoint. Now, when a deadly missile is launched against a large city in such wise that it cannot be directed against any particular military objective, but is likely to strike in the midst of a residential district, those who use it are placing an action which by its very nature will probably directly kill some non-combatants. This is what apparently happens when the "robot bombs" are used; accordingly, the use of these instruments of warfare is intrinsically immoral—at least as they have been employed by Germany in attacking England. Therefore, our military forces are not allowed to use them in this manner, even to retaliate and to shorten the war. Two wrongs do not make a right; and it is never permitted to perform an action that is intrinsically wrong, even as a retaliatory measure.

A CONFESSOR'S PROBLEM

Question: A parish priest realizes that every Saturday afternoon for several months a teaching sister from a neighboring parish has been coming to him to confession in the church. As far as he can judge, the only reason she has for substituting him for the ordinary confessor is that she regards him as better suited to direct her spiritual life. What action should the priest take, in view of the law (Can. 520, §1) that the ordinary confessor of a religious community shall hear the confessions of all the nuns?

Answer: The Church is most anxious that reasonable liberty be given to religious women in the choice of a confessor. Hence, the Code permits a nun to go to confession to any priest approved by the ordinary of the place for hearing the confessions of women, provided certain conditions are fulfilled. The conditions are that the confession be heard in a place destined for women's confessions and that the religious approach the confessor for the tranquillity of her conscience (Can. 522; cf. Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest*, I, 295; II, 161). The condition "ad suae conscientiae tranquillitatem" is interpreted very generously by theologians. Cappello states that this condition is fulfilled as often as the nun goes to confession seriously—that is, with the intention of confessiong her sins sacramentally and of receiving absolution from them (*De Sacramentis*, Vol. II, n. 442). Nevertheless, it is certainly not the mind of the Church that a religious shall habitually substitute another confessor for the regular confessor merely because of personal preference. Hence, the priest in the present case should explain to the nun that she should not confess to him regularly by virtue of the ruling on confession "ad conscientiae tranquillitatem." At the same time he might inform her of another point of Church law—that a nun may ask for a special confessor, in place of the ordinary confessor, "for peace of soul and for greater progress in the way of God" (Can. 520, §2). If she believes that this condition is present in her case, she may ask the bishop to have the parish priest in question assigned as her special confessor; and it is the wish of the Church that the request be granted unless special circumstances render this procedure inadvisable.

SUM FOR GRAVE THEFT

Question: What would be regarded nowadays as the absolute sum for grave theft in the United States?

Answer: By the absolute sum for grave theft is meant that amount of money, the stealing of which constitutes a mortal sin, irrespective of the financial status of the individual or corporation from whom it is taken, however wealthy they may be. Naturally this sum varies with the fluctuation of the value, or the purchasing power, of money. In a large country like ours it is quite possible that this sum might be different in different sections. To lay down a general norm, in view of actual conditions and the value of money, it would seem that the absolute sum for grave theft would be about $40.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

THE LIGHTED CANDLE AT BAPTISM

Question: Is it necessary that both the godfather and the godmother touch the lighted candle when it is presented towards the end of the baptismal ceremony? The godmother is usually occupied with holding the child so that it is difficult for her to take the candle.

Answer: The *Codex Juris* (Canon 762, §1) requires a sponsor (godparent) at Baptism for each subject. It further legislates (Canon 764) that two, one male and one female, is the maximum number of sponsors to be admitted for each person baptized. These prescriptions are reiterated in the Ritual (Tit. II, Cap. 1, 31, 33).

Throughout the ceremonial of Baptism, as found in the Ritual, provision is made for responses by the godfather only, who replies, in the name of the child, to the interrogations of the priest. The only instances where sponsors are mentioned in the plural number are for the recitation of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer, which the officiant is directed to say *cum susceptoribus*, and at the actual moment of Baptism when both sponsors, where two are present, are instructed to hold the child during the pouring of the water. When the lighted candle is presented, the rubric calls for it to be given either to the candidate or to the godfather.

Our conclusion is, therefore, that just as it is sufficient that the responses be made by the godfather alone, the godmother functioning only by holding or touching the child at the pouring of the water, so the rubric of the Ritual is fulfilled by the presentation of the lighted candle to the godfather alone. However, the common custom is to have both godparents make the responses together and so both may touch the lighted candle at the end of the ceremony, the godfather holding the candlestick and the godmother touching it. If it is awkward for her to give this cooperation, it should be remembered that it is not required of her by the rubric of the Ritual.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

A YOUNG NAVAL OFFICER ON AFTERNOON MASS

The Padre holds Mass every afternoon, and by desisting from food and liquidities (such as they are!) from four o'clock in the afternoon on, one may go to Holy Communion. Needless to say, this is a privilege of which I freely avail myself. One hour's fast is required.

Incidentally, I'm all in favor of this afternoon Mass. After the war, this combat practice should be adopted all over America. Guys going home from the office, kids getting out of school, housewives returning from market, etc., all could stream into the little and big churches of the land with much less effort than in the early hours when brains are foggy and throats taste as though that famed stocking-footed army had been trespassing therein.

Did you ever go to an afternoon (late) Mass or to an evening Mass, when all your senses were keenly alive and the Latin wasn't just mere words? It really makes you a lot more interested. I'm all for it. And whoever had the evening Mass would be able to get some late sleep, which should be some incentive to the alpaca-clad brethren. How about it?

Think of the picture! At dusk time, when the day's work is over, and the mind turns in upon itself for personal thought as the body relaxes, all the lights in the churches would go on, and it would be an interesting psychological (and good!) break in the daily routine, and for lots of guys who have to punch clocks in the morning, so much easier.

—From a letter sent by a U. S. Navy lieutenant to his brother, a priest.

ANALECTA

Included among the papal documents of 1943 on which a report was made in the previous issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* were the documents appearing during 1944 in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* through p. 128 of the fourth number. This present report, then, commences with the fifth number of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, at the very beginning of which one finds the Encyclical Letter of our Holy Father in commemoration of the fifteenth centenary of the death of St. Cyril of Alexandria. In this encyclical our Holy Father appeals to the Oriental sects who hold St. Cyril in great esteem to follow his example of orthodoxy and to return to the fold. All the faithful are urged to pray for this propitious end, especially through the intercession of the Blessed Virgin whose stout defender St. Cyril was. Not only the orthodoxy of St. Cyril's faith is extolled, but also his intense charity, a virtue so strong in him that he proclaimed that no one could love Nestorius more than he. This was a type of the love that should animate the souls of the faithful who strive for the reconciliation of the straying brethren with the Church, a benevolence that will promote mutual understanding, a benevolence which finds its typical expression in the Pontifical Institute at Rome founded for the promotion of higher studies in matters pertaining to the Oriental Rites.[1]

Fifteen days later, on April 24, our Holy Father directed an epistle to His Eminence, Luigi Cardinal Maglione, expressing his desire that during the month of May devotion to the Blessed Virgin should be intensified, especially on the part of youth, with the aim of imploring her intercession in the cause of peace. At the end of this epistle, as at the end of the Encyclical Letter reported above, our Holy Father imparts his blessing to all who respond to his appeal.[2]

Two epistles of congratulation are reported in the sixth number of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis:* one of Feb. 28 to His Eminence, Henry Cardinal Sibilia, on the sixtieth anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood;[3] the other of March 20 to Most Reverend

---

[1] *AAS*, XXXVI (1944), 129.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 145.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 163.

Oscar Joliet, Protonotary Apostolic and Rector of the Pontifical Belgian College in Rome on the completion of the College's first centenary.[4]

On June 2, the Feast of St. Eugene, our Holy Father delivered an allocution to the Cardinals in response to their felicitations on the occasion of the Feast of his patron. He recalled that the year intervening between this and the previous similar occasion was one filled with grief and he expressed the depth of his own sorrow over the misery that has come even to the Eternal City and his unceasing striving to relieve the needs of the suffering everywhere but particularly at Rome, a task made the more difficult by the refusal of many to hearken to his word who speaks as the successor of the Apostle to whom our Lord said, "Feed my lambs! Feed my sheep!" Indeed, the very calamities are the fruit of that separation and particularly of the rationalism and the naturalism of the last two centuries. As a consequence, it was appropriate at that moment, which occurred during the Octave of Pentecost, that the Holy Spirit should be invoked to accomplish the union of Christians with the Holy See in order that they might realize to the full the opportunities opening up to them. He approved clemency in the victor and pointed out that the fear of total destruction creates the courage of desperation and prolongs the war. It is, then, but the part of sagacious politics to create hope in the conquered that they will remain a people possessing the necessities of life and assigned juridically a dignified position in the world.[5]

THE SACRAMENTS

On May 12, 1944, the Sacred Congregation of Rites issued a decree stating that in an audience given to the Cardinal Prefect on that day, our Holy Father, in answer to the petition of many local Ordinaries, and due to the peculiar exigencies of the times, to which the concession was to be understood to be limited, granted that the purifications and ablutions of the chalice which the rubrics prescribe shall be performed first with wine and then with wine and water, may be performed with water alone in those places in which, in the prudent judgment of the Ordinary, a scarcity of wine prevails or is foreseen.[6]

---

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 164.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 166.

On March 24, the Sacred Apostolic Penitentiary issued an instruction regarding general absolution. The following may be absolved by priests even though the latter be not approved for confessions, and general absolution may be given them: soldiers when battle is imminent or in progress, inasmuch as they are in danger of death, but only when the confessions can not be heard individually because of the great number of penitents or the lack of time; and if it is foreseen that it will be morally impossible to grant even general absolution at such a time, the general absolution may be given as soon as necessary; soldiers and civilians may be so absolved during hostile invasion. Outside the cases in which danger of death exists, general absolution may not be given, not therefore merely because a great assembly of persons has gathered together, for instance, to celebrate some great feast or to gain some special indulgence. If some other grave cause exists proportionate to the divine precept of the preservation of the integrity of confession, general absolution is permissible, as in the case in which the penitents, without any fault of their own, would be obliged to do without Holy Communion and its sacramental grace for a long time. It rests with the local Ordinary to determine whether the urgency just described exists in particular cases, and priests must have recourse to him when it is possible to do so.

Before granting general absolution priests are obliged to warn the faithful that sorrow and a firm purpose of amendment are required, to be expressed externally if possible, for instance, by the striking of the breast, and that the sins absolved by general absolution must be confessed when next the penitents approach the Sacrament of Penance. Moreoever the faithful are to be warned that they dare not postpone confession of mortal sins when this obligation is pressing on them under either the divine or the ecclesiastical law, in order to benefit by a general absolution. Local Ordinaries are to warn their priests of these norms and of the serious gravity of the office entrusted to them when the use of faculties for general absolution is permitted them in special situations. The usual formula is to be used if time permits; otherwise, the short formula: "Ego vos absolvo ab omnibus censuris et peccatis in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti."[7]

---

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 154.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 155; cf. *Responsum* S. Paen. Ap., Dec. 10, 1940 (*AAS*, XXXII [1940], 571; *The Jurist*, I [1941], 155).

BEATIFICATION AND CANONIZATION

On Jan. 28, our Holy Father signed the Commission of the Introduction of the Cause of Louise Nicolle of the Third Order of St. Dominic, Foundress of the Humble Daughters of the Sacred Heart;[8] and on Feb. 27, the Sacred Congregation promulgated the decree of our Holy Father attesting to the practice of the theological and cardinal virtues in heroic degree by Venerable Placid Baccher, diocesan priest of the Third Order of St. Dominic.[9]

PROHIBITION OF BOOKS

On June 17, the Holy Office published a decree placing on the Index all the works of Ernest Buonaiuti appearing after its decree of March 26, 1924, under which all his previous works had been condemned. Particular censure is given his "Storia del Cristianesimo."[10]

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

---

[8] *AAS,* XXXVI (1944), 149.

[9] *Ibid.,* p. 152.

[10] *Ibid.,* p. 176.

Book Reviews

MOLDERS OF THE MEDIEVAL MIND. By Rev. Frank P. Cassidy, Ph.D. St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1944. Pp. viii + 194. $2.00.

In spite of the immense and fruitful labors of two generations of European scholars, seconded by a growing number of American disciples, all too many educated Americans feel as far removed from the Middle Ages as they do from the moon. Many pay lip service to the great medieval achievements in every cultural field, but neither understand nor desire to understand its chief glory, the majestic system of thought which they regard as merely an interesting cultural ruin. They think of our modern world as being closer to Imperial Rome than to the Middle Ages, and they regard the medieval period as an interruption of the cultural cycle rather than as a development and crystallization of all that went before. Thus it appears on the stage of history in the sorry role of a cultural Melchisedech, without ancestry or posterity.

Others know that there is much to learn from the medieval period but they fail to grasp the underlying continuity connecting it with us and the Romans, and they are appalled, too, by the voluminous literature, usually in German or French, that confronts the earnest inquirer. It is for the benefit of these students that Dr. Cassidy has compiled this unpretentious book which he modestly describes as an introductory study. He has taken for his theme the influence of the Fathers on the mind of the Middle Ages. They were the heirs of the Romans and the progenitors of the Schoolmen, and it is precisely their position between two great epochs that makes them so important, and, in many ways, so difficult to understand.

After a brief but competent account of Roman education and of the relation of Christianity to early Western civilization, we are given some eighteen thumb-nail sketches of outstanding personalities of the Eastern and Western Churches, ranging from the second to the eighth centuries, together with a summary of their writings. Dr. Cassidy's analysis of the pedagogical theories of the Fathers is admirably done and is, perhaps, the best thing in the book. This is followed by a chapter on the attitude of the Fathers toward pagan culture. In preparing this chapter, Dr. Cassidy might well have read "The Attitude of Jerome towards Pagan Literature," by A. S. Pease, the distinguished professor of Latin at Harvard (*Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association,* L, 150-67), and Cochrane's masterly work, *Christianity and Classical Culture.* The bibliographies, within the limits set by the author, are full and adequate. Dr. Cassidy is to be congratulated on having accomplished what he set out to accomplish, namely, to stimulate interest in the Fathers of the Church, to rescue them from the literary limbo in which they have for so long reposed, and thus to redeem the Church from the charge of neglecting her own incomparable treasures. I have noticed only a few slips in the printing: p. 138, n. 91, for "1909," read "1919"; p. 181, for "Battifol," read "Batiffol"; and p. 188, for "monagamia," read "monogamia."

J. P. CHRISTOPHER

WITH THE HELP OF THY GRACE. By John V. Matthews, S.J., S.T.D., Mag. Agg. (Pont. Greg. Univ.). Westminster, Md.: The Newman Book Shop, 1944. Pp. 114. $1.50.

In recent years attempts have been made in certain quarters to adapt the scientific and speculative theology of the Scholastic in some measure to the more practical needs of the preacher in the pulpit and the teacher in the classroom. It is maintained that the gap between the theology of the lecture-hall and that of the pulpit is too great, and as a result much of the time and labor spent by the professor on the student of theology is lost on the young preaching and teaching priest of tomorrow. Certainly among the theological treatises to which this objection can be pointed is the one on Grace. With almost every major point involved in some intricate controversy — even such a fundamental matter as the very essence of grace — the young mind emerging from the treatise is not armed with that ready knowledge which can be put to immediate use without much further labor. The result is that more accurate and advanced expositions of the doctrine of grace, be it in preaching or instruction, are avoided.

The book under review is a successful attempt to present in an elementary way the meaning, necessity and the powers of grace, especially actual grace. It is written with great simplicity and clarity. The volume comprises in question and answer form twenty-one lessons or chapters, and in this form it constitutes a course on grace which can be used very practically for the school. No doubt, the author attains his purpose in bringing about a more accurate understanding and a deeper appreciation of that divine gift which is grace. The method and order can be recommended notwithstanding the repetitions. No attempt was made by the author at explaining one of the most difficult problems in the treatise on grace, viz., that of reconciling actual grace with the free will of man. It would have been well to associate the name of the Holy Ghost with the sources of grace (p. 10) and to tie up the external providence of God with the external graces (pp. 13 f.).

STANISLAUS J. GRABOWSKI

THE GENERAL WHO REBUILT THE JESUITS. By Rev. Robert G. North, S.J. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1944. Pp. xii + 292. $3.00.

If you glance through the standard histories of the Church in the nineteenth century, you will find very little about John Philip Roothaan, twenty-first General and second founder of the Society of Jesus. It is, however, likely that this Dutch priest who more than any other man is responsible for the resurgence of the Society after the destruction of 1773 will grow in historical stature. Father Roothaan consciously sank his personality in his task and probably will always be more or less hidden. But the magnitude of the work accomplished is bound eventually to raise from comparative obscurity this saintly and efficient ruler.

Father North's biography is popular in form but thoroughly reliable in content. In it we are able to follow Father Roothaan from his birth in 1785 at Amsterdam in Holland to his death in Rome in 1853. As a youth, young Roothaan frequented the church in Amsterdam which was served by ex-Jesuits. One of these priests exerted a decisive influence on the boy who at the age of nineteen made the long voyage to White Russia to join the Society of Jesus, which had survived there among the Polish subjects of Catherine the Great.

Expelled from Russia as a priest in 1820, Father Roothaan soon made a name for himself as a popular preacher in Switzerland and later on as a superior in Italy. In 1829, at the age of forty-four, he was chosen General of the Society of Jesus. He governed for twenty-four eventful and difficult years — years which saw the risings against the Society in 1834-35, when, to mention only the most gruesome outrage, fifteen Jesuits were murdered in Madrid; and the expulsions of 1848-49, when the Jesuits were driven from nearly all European countries. In the midst of misfortune, the General, with true Dutch persistency, kept at his task and was able to consolidate his Society internally despite the political tempests.

Father Roothaan strove incessantly to keep the spiritual and intellectual level of the Society of Jesus high. The *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius seemed to him amply sufficient to effect the spiritual betterment of his subjects. Father Roothaan revived their use with happy results. Father North hints that, in the intellectual field, Father Roothaan's fidelity to the classical tradition led to the loss of a "grand opportunity to assume world leadership in education by emphasizing the vernacular literature and the social and scientific subjects currently in vogue." This seems debatable. Indeed, Father North himself recognizes the abiding value of the revival of Scholasticism in which Father Roothaan played a part.

Father North frankly faces the charge that the American Society prospered in spite of Father Roothaan rather than because of him (pp. 233 f.). Admitting that this far-sighted General had more frequently to bridle the energy of his sons in America than to spur them on to greater efforts, Father North rightly points out that Father Roothaan's moderating influence was precisely what was needed to prevent an expansion which might have developed into an explosion.

Those unacquainted with the facts of Father Roothaan's life might think that Father North's highly readable narrative is somewhat fictional in character. The fine bibliography and the abundance of notes which are printed in a novel manner in the back of the book should dispel any such idea. Without sacrificing scholarship, Father North has succeeded in being interesting.

E. A. RYAN, S.J.

SAVING ANGEL. By T. Lawrason Riggs. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1944. Pp. xiii + 98. $1.75.

The adage, *multum in parvo,* can well be applied to this work of the late Father Riggs. In stating the purpose of his work the author says that it is not to be another biography of St. Joan of Arc. Furthermore, it is his intention to avoid controversy concerning the voices and visions which inspired Joan's mission. He states: "The subject which this book does propose to discuss, if not exhaustively, at least clearly, is that of Joan's relation with the doctrinal and disciplinary authority of the Catholic Church. It will also consider the Church's judgment on these relations after Joan's death."

There is need for a sound, accurate account of St. Joan's relation with the Church. In 1431 Joan of Arc was burned at the stake as a heretic. In 1920 Benedict XV said: "In honor of the Holy and Undivided Trinity . . . . We declare that the Blessed Joan of Arc is a saint." These two events at first seem irreconcilable unless one adopts the opinion, popularized by Mr. Bernard Shaw, who says that Joan was both heretic and saint, in fact, "one of the first Protestant martyrs." The Church, according to Shaw, was capable of the "magnificent Catholic gesture" of canonizing a Protestant saint as "a person of heroic virtue whose private judgment is privileged."

Saving Angel aims to give an answer to this seeming contradiction. In the first section of the book that briefly and accurately takes us from Joan's birth at Domrémy to her death at Rouen, there is a detailed account of the history of the trial, stressing the juridical procedure. The second part is taken up with a specialized study of the whole process of Joan's rehabilitation carried out first under royal auspices and then under ecclesiastical. This time the ecclesiastical court was Rome which gave power to deal with the matter to three French bishops who appointed Jean Bréhal as the Inquisitor. It is from Bréhal that we have the famous *Recollectio,* a document that depends not only on the rehabilitation witnesses, but also on the official record of the Rouen trial. On July 7, 1456, a new verdict on Joan was promulgated. This confirms the promoter's condemnation of the twelve articles of accusation as fraudulent, calumnious and malicious, and therefore annuls them. Reasons for condemning the rest of the trial are then given: the sentences, the quality of the judge, the fraud and intimidation by which the so-called abjuration was wrung from Joan. The verdict ends by declaring the trials and sentences against Joan, which are tainted with fraud, calumny, injustice, contradiction, and manifest error of law and fact, to be utterly null and void. Of this matter Bréhal in his *Recollectio* writes: "From which it is evident that a sentence of this sort proceeds, not from discretion, the mother of virtues, but from the stepmother of justice, namely, the voluntary haste of vengeful man, and is, therefore, null."

Father Riggs knew precisely what he wanted to write and how to write it. This book gives a clear, succinct, and logical presentation of the truth about St. Joan of Arc and her relation with the Church. It shows why the ignominious inscription: "Heretic, Relapse, Apostate, Idolater" placed above the stake at Rouen should be changed into the glorious title, "St. Joan of Arc."

To the work is added a short biographical note and excerpts from Bréhal's *Recollectio* together with English translations. Congratulations are due to the General Editor of the Science and Culture Series and to the Bruce Publishing Company for furnishing a work that fills a definite need for the English-speaking reader in general and for the educated Catholic in particular.

ALFRED C. RUSH, C.SS.R.